

nue for the Government and establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of C. N. Cook & Son, of Alexandria Bay, N. Y., protesting against the reenactment of the war-revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: Petition of Glen Hosiery Co., of Wilmington, Del., favoring bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs in United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NOLAN: Protest of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, the Building Trade Employers' Association, the Simonds Manufacturing Co., and sundry other corporations and individuals of San Francisco, Oakland, Sacramento, and San Jose, against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the employment of efficiency methods on Government work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the German-American Alliance of San Diego, Cal., relative to embargo on shipment of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, favoring the matter of railway mail pay being placed under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petition of J. R. Montgomery Co., of Windsor Locks, Conn., favoring protection for manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Fitchburg (Mass.) Woman's Club, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9014, for the relief of John O. Kinney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9015, granting an increase of pension to John E. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of James R. Reid, of Elmira, N. Y., asking that a paragraph including Regular Army officers be placed in the Townsend bill, which favors a retired list for the volunteer commissioned officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio: Petition of German Baptist Mutual Insurance Co., of Miami County, Ohio, protesting against motor vehicles along rural routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SELLS: Petitions of sundry business men of the first congressional district of Tennessee, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISSON: Petition of Eupora (Miss.) Christian Temperance Union, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petitions of citizens of the fourteenth congressional district of Texas, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Rhode Island Chapter of American Institute of Architects, protesting against the passage of House bill 743, relative to building for the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Great Falls Woolen Co., of Somersworth, N. H., favoring protection for manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of Susie Sprague Chite and other citizens of Holyoke, Colo., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 17, 1916.

Rev. Lauritz Larsen, pastor of the Zion Norwegian Lutheran Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Eternal and Almighty God, Thou Author and Giver of all good things, we thank Thee for Thy manifold blessings to us. We pray Thee that Thou wilt be our guide, and that through the example of Thy divine Son, our Master, we may be guided in all things; that we may be given wisdom in all the matters that Thou hast given us to attend to; that we may be true to Him who hath given us the Divine Word of service, saying, "Whosoever would be great among you let him be your servant." Help us, bless us, and guide us, we ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the fol-

lowing bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 406. An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium; and

H. R. 8493. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 320. An act to authorize the county of Bonner, Idaho, to construct a bridge across Pend Oreille River;

H. R. 775. An act granting the consent of Congress to J. P. Jones and others to construct one or more bridges across the Chattahoochee River between the counties of Coveta and Carroll, in the State of Georgia; and

H. R. 7611. An act authorizing the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., a corporation, to construct and operate a bridge, and approaches thereto, across what is known as "Back River," a part of the Savannah River, at a point between Jasper County, S. C., and Chatham County, Ga.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PHELAN. I present a telegram from the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, in opposition to a suggested invasion of Mexico and in favor of an enlarged Army and Navy, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CAL., January 15, 1916.

Hon. JAMES D. PHELAN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Suggested invasion of Mexico by American troops most objectionable to our people. We advise enlarged Army and Navy to protect our border, our coast, and harbors. Hope you will use every influence to this end, for Pacific coast interests demand protection rather than invasion.

LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
ROBT. N. BULLA, President.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of the members of Company H, Second Infantry, National Guard of Florida, of Tampa, Fla., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of H. N. Wood & Co., of Lakeport, N. H., and a petition of the Tilton Woolen Mills, of Tilton, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Martha S. Kimball, of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Navy League of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for a prohibitive tax on intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the regents of the University of Minnesota, St. Anthonys Park, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made for the building of a high dam to provide water power for the citizens of St. Paul and Minneapolis, in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WARREN presented petitions of the Sweetwater County Federated Trades and Labor Council, of Rock Springs; of Local Union No. 2742, United Mine Workers of America, of Carneyville; and of Local Union No. 2055, United Mine Workers of America, of New Acme, all in the State of Wyoming, praying for the printing of the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations as a public document, which were referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 2055, United Mine Workers of America, of New Acme, Wyo., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CUMMINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hesper, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to fix a standard price for trade-marked and patented articles, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. POMERENE presented a petition of the Mitchell Manufacturing Co., of Portsmouth, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHIELDS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Chattanooga, Tenn., and a petition of sundry citizens of Knoxville, Tenn., praying for an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of Local Union No. 1289, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, of Ivy Hill; of Local Union No. 1685, National Farmers' Union, of Elizabethton; and of sundry citizens of Summertown, all in the State of Tennessee, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Knox County Rural Letter Carriers' Association, of Knoxville, Tenn., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the postal laws relating to the transfer of rural letter carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maryville and Huntingdon, in the State of Tennessee, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Nashville, Tenn., praying for an increase in the compensation of railroads for transporting the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Automobile Club of Nashville, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the highways of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Commerce of Knoxville, Tenn., praying that an appropriation be made for the purchase of additional lands for forest reserves, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Chattanooga, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to relieve the congested condition of freight on the eastern seaboard, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a memorial of Local Union No. 204, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, of New Braunfels, Tex., and a memorial of sundry citizens of League City, Tex., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Pennsylvania Association of Union Volunteer Officers, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called volunteer officers' retirement bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Philadelphia Bourse, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the repeal of the so-called seamen's law, and also for the enactment of legislation to develop the merchant marine, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. NORRIS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Nebraska, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minden, Nebr., praying for the placing of an embargo on the exportation of munitions of war, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of Local Union No. 430, Brotherhood of Post Office Employees, of Norwich, Conn., and a petition of Local Branch No. 35, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of New Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of Local Branch No. 22, United States Civil Service Employees, of Newburgh, N. Y.,

praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a petition of the H. B. Claffin Corporation, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Watertown, N. Y., and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Utica, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to relieve the congested condition of freight on the eastern seaboard, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Utica, N. Y., praying for an increase in the compensation of railroads for transporting the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of the Admore Woolen Mills Co., of Yantic, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROTECTION OF GAME IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3205) to amend "An act to protect the birds and animals in Yellowstone National Park, and to punish crimes in said park, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1894, reported it without amendment.

FEDERAL JUDGES.

Mr. CUMMINS. From the Committee on the Judiciary I present a favorable unanimous report on Senate resolution 66 directing the Judiciary Committee of the Senate to make inquiry and report the number of Federal judges now holding office who are unable to discharge substantially the duties of a judge, and so forth, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 66, submitted by Mr. CUMMINS on the 11th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee of the Senate be directed to make inquiry and report: First, as to the number of Federal judges now holding office who are unable to discharge substantially the duties of a judge; second, whether, under the Constitution, such judges, if any, can be removed from office; third, if they can be so removed, what is the proper procedure?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we have a bill pending here which has been reported and takes precedence of the resolution. I think the resolution should go to the calendar ordinarily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go to the calendar.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT (S. DOC. NO. 246).

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I ask that the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, Sixty-second Congress, second session, submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] on the power of the Government over the development and use of water power within the respective States, be printed as a Senate document. It is a very short report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SHIELDS. I also ask that the views presented by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], members of the Committee on the Judiciary, be printed to accompany the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3554) providing for the leasing of arid lands which are irrigable, belonging to Indian allottees, and fixing the maximum time for which such leases may run; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3555) to provide for the securing of deposits in postal savings banks in cities and towns of less than 15,000

inhabitants by bonds of bonding companies; when such deposits shall be deposited in national or State banks located in such cities or towns; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 3556) to establish a military academy at or near Fort Douglas, Utah; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3557) to fix the price for gas in the District of Columbia and prescribing punishment for its violation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 3558) granting an increase of pension to Louis Miller (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 3559) to provide for the erection of a public building at Columbia, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 3560) to validate certain titles wherein the purchase money has been paid on sales by order of the United States circuit or district court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3561) to correct the military record of Robert D. Magill;

A bill (S. 3562) to correct the military record of Joseph R. Berg;

A bill (S. 3563) to grant an honorable discharge to John W. Jester; and

A bill (S. 3564) to correct the military record of John L. McGregor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3565) granting a pension to Erastus J. Bierbower;

A bill (S. 3566) granting a pension to Edward J. Hart;

A bill (S. 3567) granting an increase of pension to Philip Smathers;

A bill (S. 3568) granting a pension to Alfred L. Jackson;

A bill (S. 3569) granting a pension to Mary P. McCarty;

A bill (S. 3570) granting an increase of pension to John Stouffer;

A bill (S. 3571) granting a pension to Mary Rauch;

A bill (S. 3572) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Pennington (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3573) granting a pension to Moses P. Osborn;

A bill (S. 3574) granting a pension to Ellwood C. Dixon;

A bill (S. 3575) granting a pension to Bernard Closkey;

A bill (S. 3576) granting an increase of pension to Peter Sheplar;

A bill (S. 3577) granting an increase of pension to Cerelle Shattuck;

A bill (S. 3578) granting an increase of pension to A. Y. Whitmoyer; and

A bill (S. 3579) granting a pension to Sarah A. Spriggle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 3580) releasing the claim of the United States Government to lot No. 306 in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; and

A bill (S. 3581) releasing the claim of the United States Government to that portion of land, being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 3582) prohibiting the interment of the body of any person in the cemetery known as the Cemetery of the White's Tabernacle, No. 39, of the Ancient United Order of Sons and Daughters, Brethren and Sisters of Moses, in the District of Columbia (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. BURLEIGH):

A bill (S. 3583) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Carman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3584) making an appropriation for the construction of a dry dock at the Puget Sound Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3585) providing for the disposal of certain lands in block 32, in the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington; and

A bill (S. 3586) for the relief of settlers on Northern Pacific Railroad lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3587) providing for the survey and commencement of construction of a road in the Olympic Forest Reserve; and

A bill (S. 3588) appropriating \$100,000 to be used by the Forest Service in constructing a road from the town of Glacier to Mount Baker in the Mount Baker Forest Reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 3589) setting aside certain lands in the District of Columbia as a site for memorials to women; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 3590) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Bates (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3591) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural roads; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 3592) to remodel the old post-office building at Austin, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 3593) authorizing the issuance of land patents to religious organizations in certain cases, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3594) to grant to the various States the lands owned by the United States within the limits thereof; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 3595) for the relief of Milton C. Conners and George G. Conners, doing business under the firm name of Conners Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 3596) granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment; and

A bill (S. 3597) to amend an act entitled "An act to further regulate interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the transportation therein for immoral purposes of women and girls, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 3598) to suppress the sale of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms of like form, size, and description, commonly used in the commission of felonious homicides and assaults, and to provide punishment for violation of the provisions of the same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3599) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Johnson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 3600) granting a pension to Robert Howlett (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3601) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Young (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN: A bill (S. 3602) granting an increase of pension to Kate M. White (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 3603) granting a pension to Margaret J. Berry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3604) regulating the use of the mails relative to loans, etc.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 3605) authorizing the President to appoint Archibald Grymes Hutchinson a first lieutenant of Infantry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3606) for the relief of the contributors of the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund; and

A bill (S. 3607) for the relief of Nelson D. Dillon, executor of Harriet A. Dillon, deceased, widow of Robert Dillon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 3608) granting a pension to Thomas J. Wilson;

A bill (S. 3609) granting a pension to Anna E. Newbury;

A bill (S. 3610) granting a pension to William G. Neeley;

A bill (S. 3611) granting a pension to Hiram B. Kelly; and

A bill (S. 3612) granting an increase of pension to Henry Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 3613) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lewisburg, W. Va. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3614) authorizing the President to regulate matters of sanitation, quarantine, taxation, and police in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. GORE. I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 79) authorizing and directing the President to enter into an agreement with the recognized head of the Mexican Government, under which order shall be restored and life rendered secure in that portion of Mexico adjacent to the United States, was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, etc. That the President is hereby authorized, and, in case the prevailing disorder in Mexico is not brought under control by the de facto government thereof before the approval of this act, the President is directed to enter into negotiations with the recognized head of said government with a view to the establishment of a neutral zone along the northern border of Mexico to be jointly policed by the Governments of Mexico and the United States until such time as order may be restored and the lives and property of American citizens rendered secure under the law, at which time the forces of the United States shall be withdrawn from Mexican territory.

2. That in order to carry into effect the terms of any agreement entered into in pursuance of this resolution the President is empowered to employ such part of the naval and military forces of the United States as may be necessary to that end.

3. That this act shall take effect from and after its approval.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment providing for an appropriation from the several appropriations for protection, improvement, and management, etc., of the various national parks, including the Hot Springs Reservation, as well as from the revenues from privileges, etc., in the national parks and the Hot Springs Reservation, such sum or sums as the Secretary of the Interior, in his judgment may deem necessary, to be expended in employment of competent persons in the District of Columbia and in the field, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHIELDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3393) amending an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes," which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections and ordered to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. ASHURST submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 69), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had on the pending Senate concurrent resolution No. 4, such stenographer to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$1 per printed page, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 70), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ a stenographer at a cost not to exceed \$1 per printed page to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee at any time, and to have such hearings printed for the use of the committee; that the expenses of such hearings be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of a subcommittee; and that the said committee and all subcommittees thereof may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

SAN FRANCISCO WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, an editorial appeared in the New York Times entitled "The Hetch Hetchy fraud," and I made a reply thereto respecting legislation on the subject of the Hetch Hetchy grant passed by Congress. For the information of the Senate I think the matter should be printed.

Furthermore, as an addition to the argument, I desire to state that in pursuance of the requirements of the grant the city of San Francisco last week let a contract for \$1,500,000 for the construction of a railway to carry the material into the Hetch Hetchy Valley for the construction of dams. This shows further the good faith of the city, which has been disputed by the New York Times.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Editorial from New York Times, Jan. 9, 1916.]

THE HETCH HETCHY FRAUD.

The Hetch Hetchy Valley, as beautiful as the Yosemite, 30 miles away, was given over to use as a reservoir; a great national wonder place that was a priceless, and should have been a precious, possession of the American people forever, was ruined so that San Francisco might have a water supply. Save us or we perish of thirst, cried the clever tongues that robbed the United States of that paradise. Vainly the friends of park preservation proved that San Francisco had other and adequate sources of water supply. Vain was the campaign against the spoliation. Congress passed, President Wilson signed, the bill.

The Times and many public-spirited associations of men and women were not listened to. The lie about San Francisco's necessity was believed. It is now impudently admitted. Speaking of certain plans of the mayor of San Francisco, the Chronicle, of that city, says:

"It is not proposed to bring the Hetch Hetchy waters to the city at all. Some 'future generation' may do so, but those now alive have no means of knowing what future generations may do. At any rate the Hetch Hetchy as a source of water supply is to be dismissed from consideration."

In short, the mayor proposes to build a power plant in the Sierras for a municipal railway with \$15,000,000 of Hetch Hetchy bonds voted and issued to provide for perishing San Francisco's water supply.

Thus in its nakedness is the fraud upon the United States exposed to every eye. It is no consolation to those of us who tried to save the Hetch Hetchy Valley that our predictions come true.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 13, 1916.]

SENATOR PHELAN ON THE HETCH HETCHY PLANS—SAN FRANCISCO'S INTENTION TO DEVELOP THE GREAT FEDERAL GRANT FOR BOTH WATER AND POWER—THE LOCAL ISSUES INVOLVED.

(By JAMES D. PHELAN, United States Senator from California.)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, January 11, 1916.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I read in your edition of January 9 an editorial entitled "The Hetch Hetchy Fraud," in which you stated on the authority of the San Francisco Chronicle that "it is not proposed to bring the Hetch Hetchy waters to the City (San Francisco) at all—some future generation may do so," etc.

Of course, if this were true you would have some justification for your caption and comment, but it is not true. The San Francisco Chronicle is engaged in a local political controversy with the mayor. The facts are as follows:

San Francisco, some time since, voted \$46,000,000 to bring in water from Hetch Hetchy Valley, and the work is being diligently prosecuted. I personally visited the valley last summer and know of my own knowledge that a broad wagon road has been constructed to the heretofore inaccessible Hetch Hetchy, and that hundreds of men are employed building a diverting tunnel, about completed, to carry the Tuolumne River water by the dam site, while the work of the construction of the dam is under way, a necessary preliminary. Therefore it is the present policy of San Francisco to construct a dam for the impounding of water, and, unless it does so with diligence, under section 5 of the law passed by Congress (H. R. 7207), the Secretary of the Interior may declare forfeited all the rights of the grantee.

The mayor of San Francisco desired to purchase the existing water plant of the Spring Valley Water Co., operating it as a municipal utility, which would be more than self-supporting, and to use its distributing system so acquired for the Hetch Hetchy water when it was brought down to the city's gate. He held that as a distributing system had to be acquired, either by purchase, condemnation, or new construction, and that reservoir sites were necessary, it was not antagonistic to the Hetch Hetchy project to acquire the existing company's properties. As the Hetch Hetchy water could not be brought in for seven years and as there was a most pressing and absolute need for more water, caused by the rapidly growing population and the extension of the suburbs, he proposed to develop certain near-by sources as a temporary expedient. He submitted the proposition to the people, and the San Francisco Chronicle took the ground that such action, if taken, would defeat the completion of the Hetch Hetchy.

The people were so impressed with the idea that the makeshift would delay the completion of the Hetch Hetchy as a permanent and ample source that they voted down the mayor's proposal, which had in it many elements of practical business advantage to the municipality. It was intended to free the city from the hampering policies of the private water company and immediately secure an increased supply for the city; and it was calculated that the profits of the business would meet the cost of the new construction. But, as I stated, the people were suspicious of it, and in their zeal to bring in the Hetch Hetchy they voted it down. This certainly is evidence of good faith, and yet if the mayor's proposal prevailed it would simply have emphasized the desire of the people to get water quickly from any near-by source, although inadequate and exposed.

The city has spent \$1,500,000 already upon the Hetch Hetchy project. There is an intimation that the real purpose of the city was not to secure more water, but to acquire a hydroelectric power plant. I am again personally familiar with this phase of the subject, and desire to inform you that no thought of power development was entertained until in January, 1912. At the hearing in Washington before Hon. Walter Fischer, then Secretary of the Interior, Mayor Rolph was asked, in my presence, if the city intended to develop power. He told the Secretary, in answer to his question, that no consideration had been given to the subject, whereupon the Secretary told him that he had better consider it at once, because if the city had no intention of developing hydroelectric energy, the Department of the Interior would not permit it to lie fallow, but that the power grant would be given to some one else. The mayor asked for 24 hours to consider it, and at a conference held that night by the California delegation it was determined to assure the Secretary that with the development of water the city of San Francisco would also undertake the development of electricity for the supply of the city and the irrigation districts, which was finally included in the bill. The bill makes it incumbent upon the city to develop such power within a limited period of time, and if the city does not comply with this condition "the Secretary of the Interior may take possession of and lease to such person or persons as he may designate such portion" of the property "acquired or constructed by the grantee hereunder as

may be necessary for the development, transmission, use, and sale of such power."

This seems to be a complete refutation of any hidden or sinister purpose on the part of the city of San Francisco, and shows that the congressional act makes it incumbent for the city to develop both water and power within a limited period of time. The rents which the act requires the city to pay run from \$15,000 to \$30,000 a year and begin five years after the passage of the act.

I may state that the criticism of the act at home is that it has imposed too many onerous conditions upon the city. As to the wisdom of the passage of the act, permit me to recall an interesting episode. The press of the East was united in its opposition on the ground that it disfigured the face of nature, and in answer to that the testimony San Francisco offered was that the conversion of a meadow into a lake was not a disfigurement; that the dam site is so narrow that it will never be observed, and that the reservoir will give it the appearance of a mountain lake. There was a well-grounded suspicion that much of the opposition, however, came from the hydroelectric power trust.

The President signed the bill—Congress had passed it by large majorities—in face of this opposition. Dr. George Harvey, editor of the *North American Review*, and no friendly critic of the President, in an editorial, February, 1913, stated that never had a measure received such universal condemnation from the eastern press, and on that account he examined it as an original proposition, studying the testimony, and he came to the conclusion that the President could have done nothing else than to sign the bill, and he commended the President for what he considered an act of the highest courage.

I regret to see a recrudescence of this opposition, even though it now be vain, and I beg to assure the Times that the conduct of the people of San Francisco and their representatives in this matter has always been dictated by no other consideration than the public weal. There shall be no disfigurement of nature, and beauty places of the Sierra will by this act be made more accessible; and the great populations which shall grow upon the Bay of San Francisco, when served with cheap water and cheap power, shall bless the President and Congress for having, in the face of opposition, wisely provided a necessity of life without in any measure impairing the enjoyment of the aesthetic.

JAMES D. PHELAN.

SEIZURES OF COTTON AND FOODSTUFFS BY GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that following the routine morning business on Thursday, January 20, I shall address the Senate upon the illegality of the order of Great Britain making cotton contraband, and illegal seizures by Great Britain of foodstuffs and cotton belonging to neutrals.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his clerks, announced that the President had, on the 17th instant, approved and signed the following act:

S. 2409. An act to authorize the Ohio-West Virginia Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at the city of Steubenville, Jefferson County, Ohio.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 406. An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 8493. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

INCREASE OF WAGES IN WOOLEN MILLS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have a matter which I desire to present to the Senate before taking up the calendar, and if not out of place, and with the consent of the Senate, I should like to present it at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is a question for the Senate to decide. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, as I have said, I have a matter to present which I feel is of infinite importance to the Senate of the United States, and is particularly of importance to the Senators from Rhode Island. It is also a matter which vitally affects the interests of our whole country, and it seems to me it is but fitting and proper that the public should know the situation to which I refer.

I hold in my hand a copy of the New York Herald, which has an article headed "Six woolen mills raise wages," which reads as follows:

WOONSOCKET, R. I., Monday.

Six mills in this city, engaged in woolen and worsted weaving and employing 2,000 operatives, to-day announced a 5 per cent increase in wages, effective January 8.

I am happy to say, and the Senator from Rhode Island should be flattered to learn, that these are the Lippitt mill, the Montrose woolen, the Dunn, the Perseverance mill, and some others. This splendid intelligence conveyed from that portion of New England is most delightful to the average American to hear; but let not you Democrats on this side of the Chamber smile and "lay the flattering unction to your souls" that you are the authors of this condition through your legislation, for you are not. We have been told that we are the wreckers of mills, the

cause of the bankruptcy of institutions, and the general bedeviling of the country. You are not the authors of this prosperity. Well, Mr. President, who is or who are the authors of this prosperity? Let me read from their own statement. They say that this increase of wages is not because of prosperity. No; God forbid! Prosperity did not prompt them to make this increase, but that which occasioned it—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator from New Jersey object to the creation of a neutral zone about the center aisle of the Senate Chamber? [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I hope I am not dealing death and vengeance to Senators on the other side of the Chamber. I know that which I am to say is not exceedingly pleasant—and I say it regretfully—to the Senators from Massachusetts or to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The mill owners would have it distinctly understood, according to this article, that they did not raise wages because of Democratic prosperity or because of Democratic legislation; that was not at all the cause, they say, but it was due to the fact that they could not find labor. Great God, what has become of the idle men who were walking the streets, of whom the Senator told us? What has become of the idle men in Pennsylvania and the idle men in Rhode Island? They could not find labor.

I am reminded of a condition that prevailed in New Jersey during the time of the McKinley administration. We had a great many idle men in New Jersey during that administration. A meeting was held to decide just what was the cause of the idleness and just what could be done with the idle labor. Very many men were invited to come before the meeting to give their testimony and to express their judgment. Among those who came was a stalwart, broad, sturdy philosopher of an Irishman named Billy Mulligan. He was asked what he had to say, and Billy said, "I will tell you what I find, sirs. I have always found when there are two Pats hunting one job, then times is poor and wages is low, but when I find two jobs hunting one Pat, then wages is high and times are good." That seems to be the condition at Woonsocket, R. I.—two jobs hunting one Pat; hence times are good and wages are high.

Now, I appeal to Senators on the other side to be honest with themselves and to be honest with the country at large, to tell the world that times are good, that we have been blessed beyond parallel with wealth pouring into our coffers, and that in the goodness of your heart you have chosen to raise wages in Woonsocket, R. I.

Of course, the whole trouble about this condition, Mr. President, is that it happens at an unseemly time; it happens under a Democratic administration. If it had happened under a Republican administration the stentorian voice of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], as well as that of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, would ring the changes on the glorious prosperity which the beneficent legislation of the Republican Party had brought.

Now, I have here not only from Woonsocket, but from Massachusetts and the country over, notices of unparalleled prosperity. I have here a report from my little State, from one of the oldest banking institutions in New Jersey, the National Banking Co., of Newark, N. J. They are busy; and when I say "busy" some of these gentlemen say, "Oh, say it quietly, for it is only war busy." No; it is not war busy entirely, though some of that business also may come to us. Is a sewing machine an engine of war? No; but we are multiplying sewing machines and sending them abroad by the thousands and tens of thousands from New Jersey.

Then again, is jewelry an engine of war? We manufacture much jewelry in New Jersey, and particularly in Newark, N. J. That is literally and entirely an article of luxury. We are manufacturing jewelry by the millions of dollars worth, and we have had the same trouble that you have. We could not find men enough in the jewelry trade there, the manufacturers of jewelry could not find men enough to move the wheels and make things go.

Prosperity is the rule this land over; and I say it is unfair, it is ungenerous, and, unknowingly to you, I say it is untrue that conditions are stagnant and dull. The hives of industry this land over to-day are busy. The shafts and spindles and pulleys of the mills throughout our Commonwealth and yours are hissing and growing hot with the busy whirl of industry; the anvils are ringing out in clarion note of industry this land over.

Let us be frank with the country. If this condition has come in the unfortunate time of a Democratic administration, never-

theless as American citizens you gentlemen must reap your rich share of recompense. Cease your grudge, admit the truth, deal fairly, deal liberally with the administration that is in power. All mankind will wear a happier and a broader face in consequence of general prosperity, and you, proclaiming justice and truth and not pressing the narrowness of simple selfishness, will live longer and, thank God, die happier.

Mr. LIPPITT and Mr. GALLINGER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I am a little in doubt whether the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, in the remarks which he has made, is trying to pay me a compliment or to utter a political and partisan criticism.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh, no; far from it.

Mr. LIPPITT. As a matter of fact, the mills to which he refers in Woonsocket as bearing the name of the Lippitt Woolen Co., unfortunately I am not connected with, and, so far as I know, there is no person of the name of Lippitt who owns any stock or is interested in the management of the concern in any way. Nevertheless I am delighted to know that they are raising wages.

The Senator from New Jersey in his usual polite and emphatic manner has called upon his patron saint, "Good God," to justify the remarks which he has been making.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I suppose the Senator will appeal to the same benign influence, of course. I do not claim a monopoly on that. God knows I trust His blessings may spread over all. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIPPITT. Well, I thought the Senator from New Jersey was going to claim a monopoly upon that, because he seems to be claiming a monopoly on every other influence that causes good times and prosperity in this country.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Ah, far from it.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator from New Jersey wants the Republicans to be generous with him and admit that the prosperity which is now prevalent in the country is due to some Democratic cause, and probably having in mind the fact that the Republicans were at one time accused of stating that good crops were the result of the protective tariff he is now apparently trying to assert that present industrial conditions instead of being the result of war are the result of the Democratic tariff policy. The Senator from New Jersey knows as well as I do, when he asks us to be generous, that the cause of the present prosperity in this country is due to the fact that there is the most absolute protective tariff in force that this country has ever seen. He knows that there is a protective tariff that is defending the industries of this country, and that it is so strong that it not only defends our markets but that it defends all the neutral markets of the world against the products of Germany and of Belgium and of France and of England, because they are not able on account of the lack of laborers to continue to so great an extent as formerly in the field of production or to export such articles as they are able to produce.

Now, I want to say to the Senator from New Jersey that up to the date of August 1, 1914, in the State of Rhode Island neither the Lippitt Woolen Co. nor any other manufactory of any kind was considering the question of raising wages. The fact is that those factories were running on half time; that there were two "Pats" seeking jobs all over the State of Rhode Island and in every part of New England. I will say, also, to the Senator from New Jersey that the result of Democratic tariff policies in the State of Rhode Island was that for the first six months of the year 1914 the laborers of Rhode Island were receiving at the rate of more than \$2,000,000 less wages than they had been receiving under the Republican administration.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. And in the meantime—

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator now comes and asks us here to be generous to him. I ask the Senator to be generous and fair and admit the fact that until the European war intervened the effect of the policies of his party was to cause disaster all over the United States.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I ask no generosity toward myself; I only ask that you shall be generous and true to yourself.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not know the Senator from Rhode Island had concluded, and I wanted to interrupt him. I want to put in the Record for the information of my good friend from New Jersey a few figures. I have looked up the facts, and find that in the last year of peace we sold to Europe woolen goods to the value of \$4,753,000, while in the first year of the war we sold

to Europe woolen goods to the value of \$32,057,000, a gain of 574 per cent. Now, Mr. President, I hope the Senator will take those figures home with him—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am not willing, nor will I—

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not yielded to the Senator. I say I hope the Senator will take these figures home with him and ask himself seriously the question whether the present prosperity in the woolen industry is not directly due to the war. The same thing exists in reference to the boot and shoe industry of New England.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. How is it with the jewelry industry?

Mr. GALLINGER. Of jewelry Germany is a great producer, and Germany can not send any kind of jewelry out into the markets of the world to-day, so that for the time being New Jersey is finding a market for jewelry, but it will not last.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. If there were no prosperity in this country, the people of this country would not be able to buy jewelry.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think they probably could afford to buy the kind of jewelry made in New Jersey under any circumstances. [Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. How is it with sewing machines?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. The Chair, under a rule of the Senate, is compelled to admonish the galleries that they must not manifest their approval. The Chair does not object, but the Senate seems to object.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey is always entertaining; the Senator from New Jersey always takes us unawares—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well—

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President, if the Senator will just restrain his impetuosity for a moment—the Senator gets hold of some Democratic newspaper—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Is the New York Herald Democratic?

Mr. GALLINGER. Such as the New York World or the New York Herald or some Democratic newspaper in New Jersey when we are unprepared for him, and bursts forth in a torrent of invective against the Republican Party and tries to make us believe—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have been flattering myself—

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, now, there— [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will be compelled to clear the galleries if order is not maintained.

Mr. GALLINGER. I had occasion to say, Mr. President, during the last session of Congress that the Senator from New Jersey approached me in a threatening attitude. [Laughter.] I do not want him to repeat that action to-day, and, if the Senator will just keep his seat and content himself for a moment, he will have an opportunity to show that the 574 per cent increase in woolen goods sent to Europe during the first year of the war, as compared with the last year of peace, had nothing to do with the prosperity of the woolen industry in this country. Of course it has had, and the same thing is true of the boot and shoe industry of New England.

The boot and shoe industry in my State—and it is a very large industry—was practically on the verge of collapse when the war commenced. The first order that was received by one New Hampshire concern was for 2,000,000 shoes from Russia, and other large orders are coming regularly from abroad. All the great shoe shops of New England are to-day prosperous, and they are prosperous because of the demand that has been made upon that industry and other industries because of this horrible war and not at all because of the Democratic tariff policy, which the Senator so vehemently defends on all occasions.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I know, Mr. President, and regretfully, too, that the portrayal of these facts is not comfortable, but, great heavens, I do not know how I am to help it; the facts are published in the daily newspapers of the country. It is unpleasant for our friends to hear that in Democratic times properous conditions exist.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. We have been hearing much about idle men stalking the streets; we have heard about soup houses. I think in stentorian tones the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], in a glorious burst of eloquence in the Senate, told us about the idle men the country over; and now, my heavens, instead of feeling bitter at me, Senators on the other side, as true patriotic Americans, should be proud of the fact that the newspapers of the country are heralding abroad

the news that these men are busy to-day and are not stalking the streets in idleness.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President, the Senator—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. One moment. As an evidence that your Republican legislation does not bring all that prosperity that you would have us believe, I cited the McKinley tariff. I remember full well the first bread line I ever saw in my life. I saw it standing at the corner of Tenth Street and Broadway, at Fleischmann's. Fleischmann was giving out bread under the Republican régime of a high protective tariff and under the McKinley administration. I never before knew what a bread line was nor a soup house. But they stood there, as I think I stated once before, on a cold, shivering night, with shrugged shoulders and chattering teeth, waiting for their bread at 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning, and the bells in Grace Church spire were ringing out the gleeful tale, "Praise God, from whom all blessings flow."

This was under a Republican administration, and yet these poor devils were seeking bread. This came about under the guardian angel of the Republican protective policy, and you have not helped the conditions one whit. We had idle men under your so-called protective policy, and idle men will come again under your protective policy.

I am willing to admit that a portion of the present prosperity has been due to the war—this unfortunate, sad, hateful war. I hate the thought, and I hate to recur to it, but I say that it is not all due to the war. I say that the country is stepping on into a revival of prosperity.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I want to congratulate him upon his gradual progress in intellectual achievement. He is now gradually coming around to the point where he is admitting part of the Republican contention. If he will only listen to the debate long enough, I have no doubt that he will get so that he will agree to the whole of it.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It will take a good long while.

Mr. LIPPITT. It is hard work to educate some people.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will say, Mr. President, after listening to the eloquent arguments presented by the Senator from Rhode Island, that it would take a good long while before I would be willing to admit—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. This is all very interesting, but I ask for the regular order of business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is the consideration of bills on the calendar under Rule VIII.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I submit to that; but I will only say, digest the facts as published.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Philippine bill, Senate bill 381.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, pending that motion I desire to say that during the last year of peace we exported \$9,000,000 worth of boots and shoes to foreign countries. During the first year of war we exported \$22,000,000 worth of boots and shoes, or an increase of 254 per cent. And yet the Senator from New Jersey calls that Democratic prosperity. It has been well called in another place "Battle-field prosperity."

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska, and that must be disposed of.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, may I not say a word on that motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is decided without debate, always—the question as to whether the Senate will or will not take up a bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I want to say that while under the rule I was not permitted to object to the motion I do not believe that course ought to be pursued. There are bills on the calendar here, and I think from the close of morning business until 2 o'clock we ought to devote the time of the Senate to the calendar, at least every other day. I think that when a bill is the unfinished business and it is debated from 2 o'clock to 5, that is plenty of time. Now, of course the motion has been carried; but I hope to-morrow, at least, we may be permitted to do something with the calendar.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, on February 5, 1908, I presented to the Senate a joint resolution, which I now send to the desk and ask the Secretary to read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5, 1908, page 1575. Mr. STONE introduced a joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas by virtue of the treaty between the United States and Spain, December 10, 1898, the United States established its control over the Philippine Islands; and

Whereas as a step toward their ultimate independence there was first established by acts of the Philippine Commission in 1901 and thereafter a scheme of provincial and municipal governments, which governments in the hands of the Filipinos themselves under an elective system have achieved and maintained order and stability; and

Whereas as a further step in the same direction, and two years after a proclamation of the complete pacification of the islands, the United States provided for an election of a Philippine Assembly, which assembly, inaugurated last October, is now, as appears from the reports of the Secretary of War, in full and satisfactory operation; and

Whereas the steps heretofore successfully taken have demonstrated and are demonstrating the justice of the claim of the Filipinos for speedy independence and their capacity for self-government; and

Whereas it is frequently urged, as a reason for refusing independence to the Philippine Islands, that some other nation would seize the islands if the United States abandoned them; and

Whereas this danger can be removed by an agreement between the United States and the great nations of Europe and Asia whereby the independence of the Philippine Islands shall be assured, and they shall be regarded as neutral territory, not open to the occupation of any other nation, as the independence of Switzerland has long been secured in Europe; and

Whereas fidelity to the fundamental principles of the American Government requires that said Government should aim to secure and safeguard the independence of said islands: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President is requested on the 10th day of December, 1913—that is to say, 15 years after the date of the Treaty of Paris—to deliver the control and possession of said islands to the authorities representing the people thereof, including also all government property therein pertaining to the administration of such government, and withdraw therefrom immediately thereafter the Army and Navy of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the United States shall retain on such date and thereafter such suitable coaling and naval stations as in the judgment of the President may seem necessary, and that the delivery of said islands to such native government shall in itself imply the assumption by it of the obligations then existing and incumbent upon the Government of the United States and consequent upon the granting of any franchise as well as the assumption of all outstanding obligations of the Government at that time existing in said islands; and be it further

Resolved, That the President is requested to open negotiations with other nations for the purpose of securing an agreement with them for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands and the recognition of their independence whenever the same shall be granted by the United States.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, on the policy outlined in that resolution I addressed the Senate at different times, pressing my views with such force as I could. While there was a strong sentiment in the Senate favorable to that policy, I was not able to secure action on the resolution, although it was kept before the Senate through two Congresses.

Since this pending bill has been before the Senate I have conferred with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], who is in charge of the measure, as to whether a declaration in substance like that embodied in the resolution I have had read should be added to the preamble of the bill as a declaration of the policy and purpose of the United States. I told him I did not wish to embarrass or interfere with his plans and would take no step without his approval, especially as I favor the bill as it is, since the bill as it is would grant a larger measure of liberty and autonomy to the Philippine people. I preferred, therefore, to leave the suggestions in his hands.

A few days ago the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] proposed an amendment to the bill before the Senate, which I will ask at this point to insert in my remarks without reading, as I presume Senators are generally familiar with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

SEC. —. The President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines, and he shall on behalf of the United States fully recognize the independence of the said Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof. This transfer of possession, sovereignty, and governmental control shall be completed and become absolute within two years from the date of the approval of this act, under the terms and in the manner hereinafter prescribed. For the purpose of a complete and prompt compliance with this direction, the President is hereby invested with full power and authority to make such orders and regulations and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines or others as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust all property rights and other relations as between the United States and the said Philippines, and to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein. In any such settlement or adjustment so made in respect to the rights and property of the United States as against the said Philippines the President shall

reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines.

Immediately after the passage of this act, the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, for the purpose and to the end that the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves, in the form of a treaty or other binding agreement, to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain, as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines for the period of five years from the taking effect of such treaty or agreement. If any of the nations so invited to join the United States in such undertaking shall decline to do so, then the President shall include as parties to such convention or agreement such nations as may be willing to join therein and to assume such obligations; and if none are willing to so unite therein, then the President is authorized to give such guaranty on behalf of the United States alone.

Mr. STONE. The same general idea runs through the joint resolution I proposed in 1908 and the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas. I think the plan proposed by the Senator from Arkansas for getting at this matter is better than the suggestion I made to the Senator from Nebraska, since the Senator by his amendment to the text of the bill seeks now, by a quick and direct method, to embody the idea of separation and neutralization into an absolute statutory enactment. That would be more effective and conclusive than a mere declaration of policy in the preamble. Unless the Senator from Nebraska and his committee colleagues are of the opinion that this amendment of the Senator from Arkansas would endanger the passage of the bill we are considering, I need hardly say that I will support the amendment, even in its present form, although it has some limitations I do not approve. I am certainly in favor of the general idea embodied in this amendment.

I wish now to address myself with respect to the idea covered by the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas—I mean especially with respect to the idea of neutralizing the Philippine Archipelago. I have in former years so fully stated my views on this subject that I shall not take much time in expressing what I have in mind to say to-day.

Mr. President, there are at least three schools of thought, three classifications of policy, prevailing in this country with respect to the Philippines: First, there are those who are unwilling to surrender the islands to their own people, withdrawing our sovereignty, at any time. The policy of those holding to this view—that is, the permanent occupation of the islands—was well expressed by the late Senator Elkins, of West Virginia, during a debate in the Senate several years ago, when he said: "The Philippine Islands constitute a part or portion of the territory of the United States," and that they would "furnish a base for operations in the East, where we must extend our commerce and protect American interests," and that they would "prove of great advantage to the United States." "Give them up!" he exclaimed, "surrender them to whom, how, when, and for what? * * * It does not belong to Anglo-Saxon blood to give up land under any circumstances." Then he added that whatever the Democratic Party might do, "the Republicans would declare and say they will never surrender our possessions and give them up for nothing—possessions that have cost us money and blood." That is one view.

Akin to this view is that maintained by those who say that at some indefinite and remote period the United States should grant independence to the Philippines. Former President Taft is a distinguished exponent of this view. He thinks that it is out of the question to talk about Philippine independence for many years to come, certainly not during this generation, and he thinks that it is both idle and vicious to even discuss the question of independence at this time. The first of these of whom I have spoken—that is, of the type of Mr. Elkins, bodily announce, with a straightforwardness of purpose we can easily understand, that they have no intention of ever surrendering our sovereignty and control over the islands; while the other class, of the type of Mr. Taft, sugar coat the bitter pill they offer the Filipinos—breathing a promise to the ear, which they must know is broken in advance to the hope.

Secondly, there is another school of thought, represented by another class of publicists, who go to the other extreme and declare that the United States should at once and forthwith, without any reservations or conditions, abandon the Philippines and turn them over to the native people there, admonishing them to take care of themselves in accordance with the old adage "Root hog or die."

This view has been expressed here in the Senate during this session, notably in the very charming and interesting speech delivered the other day by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Thirdly, there is another class of men who think that we ought speedily to grant political independence to the Filipinos,

but that we should not run away and leave them at the mercy of any powerful nation that might conclude to ravish them. The general idea of those who hold to this view is, in general terms, expressed in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] to the pending bill. It is to this last view of the question that I wish to address myself. The difference between those who favor permanency in our occupation of the islands and myself is so radical that there can be no hope of agreement between us, so I will pass that up. But as to those who really wish to confer the boon of liberty and independence upon the people of this archipelago, but who wish to do this at once and without any conditions, and without any provision whatever looking to their future safety, I think there is good reason why we should discuss this matter between us, with the hope of composing our differences.

Mr. President, it has been often said that we made a grave mistake when we took the Philippines under our jurisdiction and guardianship, making them either absolutely or qualifiedly a part of our national domain. It has been said that after the naval battle in Manila Bay, and after the Spanish authority over the islands had been overthrown through the joint efforts of our soldiery and that of the Philippines themselves fighting for their liberty, we should have sailed away and abandoned the islands to the native population, leaving them to work out their own destiny. That may be true; I will not stop to discuss that now. It is too late to discuss that. The fact is that instead of leaving the islands we took them over and put them under our sovereignty, and did this against the will of the natives. We shook loose the hand of Spanish sovereignty and thrust in our own. For more than 17 years this Government of ours has maintained a sovereign jurisdiction over the islands. And here I wish to say that during this long occupancy the work done by our people in the islands, taken as a whole, has been highly beneficial to the native population, at least in many important respects. We have aided them by teaching them the art and science of government, and have impressed upon them the great importance of order and integrity in the administration of public affairs. We have helped them enormously in educational work, and in the development of agriculture and industries of various kinds. We have taught them self-reliance and the value of a national equipage. I have no doubt that these people have been benefited immeasurably by our work among them and for them, and I am sure that they are better equipped for self-government than they were before our advent. At the same time I think it is also true that mistakes have been made, and that the people there have been the victims of misconduct on the part of American representatives and American exploiters. Our presence there has not been a thing of unmixed blessing, but taken as a whole the Philippines, in a material way, have been far more benefited than injured. Nevertheless, in the hearts of the Filipino people there has always been an inextinguishable flame burning for liberty and independence. They are a good people, a Christian people, who love their homes and country. While they recognize and admit that the conduct of their affairs under American administration has been infinitely better than when administered under Spanish jurisdiction, they still resent and protest against a foreign and alien supremacy over them. I have always sympathized with their hopes and aspirations in this behalf. Moreover, looking down through the years to come I can not escape the conviction that it would be unspeakably better for us, whether considered from a moral or material point of view, if we should sever our connection with and responsibility for the government of these people. I would rather have these people grateful to us for giving them their liberty and independence, thereby making them our fast and firm friends, than to hold them in subjection by superior force. Mr. President, I think in this direction lies the path of wisdom and safety for us.

But, Mr. President, wisely or unwisely, we have exercised power and guardianship over these people for 17 or 18 years. Wisely or unwisely, we have assumed responsibilities and obligations with respect to them which would not have attached to us if we had left them at the close of the Spanish War. As I see it, the duty we now owe is more than the mere duty of giving them independence. We are so related to them and to their history that we can not now with honor send them adrift and leave them at the mercy of any great marauding power that might appropriate them and misuse them. The whole world would look upon an act of that kind with amazement, and we would fall under the just condemnation of mankind.

What, then, should we do? We should do something along the line suggested in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas. I have no doubt that upon the initiative of the United States a joint treaty could be made between what we call the Great Powers—or between such of them as would be necessary.

to make the agreement effective—to neutralize these islands, so as to protect them against the danger of invasion and appropriation by any foreign power. Of course, this could not be done now while Europe is rent by war, but it can be done when normal conditions are restored in the world. This ought to be done and, I am sure, can be done. We owe it to these people to do this if it is possible. If we are willing to give up this great, fertile, opulent land and voluntarily withdraw our sovereignty over this important field in the Orient, how could any other nation refuse to join us in a solemn agreement to leave these people free and to protect them against outside interference with their liberty and independence? I would not limit this agreement for neutralization to a fixed period, and certainly not to any brief period like five years. That is my objection to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas—the provision which would limit the period of neutralization to five years. I do not think it is at all likely that any foreign power would seek to overrun and appropriate these islands within five years from the date of our grant of independence to them. That would be too raw, too bold, too insolent, and insulting to us. I see no good reason for placing a limit of that kind at all, and certainly not for a period less than a generation—or at least not less than for 20 years.

Mr. President, I said in the beginning that I did not wish to elaborate my views in this behalf. The extent of my wish has been only to restate with as much brevity as possible the views I have heretofore amplified on this subject. If the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and his colleagues having charge of the bill approve of the general idea and think they could safely incorporate it in this bill, I would be very glad indeed to have that done. In any event, why should not a provision of this character be inserted in the bill by the Senate? If the Senator from Nebraska should afterwards find that it was antagonized elsewhere, he could exercise his judgment as to whether he would insist upon it or recede from it. Is it not worth while, at least, to make the issue now and put it to a test?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me, I wish to make an observation in the Senator's time. The Committee on the Philippines did not consider the provision referred to because they thought it was a matter which ought to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I myself introduced a joint resolution asking the President to enter into negotiations with other leading nations of the world for the purpose of coming to some kind of agreement with relation to the neutralization of the Philippines; and I expected to appear before that committee after this bill was disposed of. I heartily agree with the Senator from Missouri that a provision of that kind would be very proper in this bill, and if it can be inserted by an amendment I have no objection to it whatever.

I agree, too, with the Senator that five years is too short a time. It ought to be of an indefinite nature. I believe there should be a limit of five years, if there is no agreement between the nations of the world and the guaranty of neutrality is made only by our Nation; but if an international agreement is made, I feel that it would be better to have unlimited time.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has made any estimate or survey of what our obligations, either legal or moral, in a financial way would be in case we should sever within a reasonable time our relations with the Philippines. We have issued, or authorized the issuance of, a considerable amount of bonds there for the improvement of cities and the construction of railroads and other public works. It seems to me that our relation to those obligation would be one either of legal or moral responsibility. Has the Senator made any estimate of that?

Mr. STONE. Has the Senator read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I have read it, but I do not recall it very fully.

Mr. STONE. That amendment makes provisions for a settlement of the question the Senator suggests as between the United States and the Philippines when the United States withdraws its sovereignty or jurisdiction over them. I assume that that can be settled as between the Philippines and this Government. I think the Philippine Government or people would assume the whole of the liabilities in cases where the Senator thinks there might be some kind of responsibility resting on us. It ought to assume responsibility for its part. All

those questions would have to be settled as a part of the arrangement under which we would withdraw.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I am inclined, as the Senator from Missouri is, to support some proposal for the severance of our relations with the Philippines as soon as it can be done consistently with the interests of the Filipino people; but it seems to me before we can act intelligently upon such an amendment as has been presented by the Senator from Arkansas it is necessary for us to have some statement from the committee having jurisdiction as to the nature and extent of these obligations, either legal or moral, for I assume that a moral obligation would be as strong as a legal one, as far as the United States is concerned.

There is another question that disturbs me, and that is as to when the Filipino people will so acquire a common language as to enable them to communicate with each other. I can not understand that any scheme of independence or of self-government will be successful unless the people of those islands can communicate their ideas to each other on such important matters as those that relate to government. When this subject was up for consideration some 8 or 10 years ago I urged in that view that it was essential that we should by direct appropriation of the United States Government aid the Filipino people in acquiring a common language. The evidence that has been presented to us indicates that to-day little less than one-half of the Filipino people are in school, and in order to educate 500,000 more, assuming that 1 teacher would be required to every 50 pupils, we would require a great many teachers. I imagine that the annual expense merely for teachers' salaries alone would aggregate a sum half as great as the entire insular revenue at present. It is very evident that they could not stand that burden, and if we wish to prepare them for self-government it will be necessary for us to assume it. It would be a matter of economy to do so.

I imagine that the maintenance of our government in the Philippine Islands, self-sustaining as they are in all domestic matters, must cost the United States in matters of military and naval defense \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 annually.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state to the Senator that the House committee, having investigated the matter, found that the cost to which he refers was \$26,000,000 a year.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Assuming that we shall desire to sever our relations with those people in 10 years, during that time we shall have incurred an expenditure of \$260,000,000 simply in the defense of the islands or in the preparation for their defense. As a matter of dollars and cents, it would be a great deal cheaper to appropriate five or ten million dollars annually for the purpose of instructing the Filipino people in a common language during that period of 10 years, involving a total expense of between fifty and one hundred million dollars, rather than to prolong our departure for 10 years longer at an expense during that additional period of \$260,000,000.

It seems to me that we ought to have some definite information upon these two important questions: First, what will it cost to give the Filipino people a common language in the shortest possible period of time in which it could be accomplished; and, second, what will be the extent of our legal and moral obligations in those islands when we cease our relations? It seems to me that the committee having charge of this matter might furnish us with that information whilst this debate is going on.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, what the Senator from Nevada has just said and the questions that were raised at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] indicate what seems to me to be the inconsistency of this bill. I have heard all of the debate upon this question, but no explanation of what the obligation of the United States rests upon, if there is such an obligation, that we should go on for an indefinite number of years expending millions of dollars annually in order to give the Filipino people a common language, with the expectation that after we have given them the common language we would abandon our investment there and unsettle the entire form of government as well as their relations between their own country and the United States.

It seems to be the idea—this is a little bit out of the order in which I expected to discuss it, and I am not going into it fully—that there is a moral obligation, to say nothing of a legal or international obligation, for the United States of America to go cruising around the world to find a people we think need a common language, who we think ought to have their country put in a sanitary or hygienic condition, who we think

are not capable of governing themselves, and to do that work for them and to teach them how to govern themselves and then abandon them. Such an obligation does not grow out of any ordinary attributes of international relations or of sovereignty of nations. The United States of America has never undertaken it in any case in its past history, except where it grew out of the incidents of a war in which we had become engaged.

Mr. President, I would have hesitated to say anything about this bill except for the fact that I, in part, represent a State and represent, in part, a section of the country which are particularly interested in the question, lying, as they do, approximately near to the Philippine Islands, being only separated from them by the easy avenue of the Pacific Ocean, which needs no dredging and which is an open channel for our ships. That section has built up a considerable intercourse with those people; some of our citizens have located there; and I could not sit in entire silence without expressing some of the feelings with which I should witness the accomplishment of what is proposed by this measure. A great number of our young men enlisted in the volunteer forces of the United States which went to the Philippines; some of them gave their lives, many of them gave their blood, in bringing about the acquisition of these islands and the restoration of peace and order there.

What has been accomplished there since that time has been described by many of the advocates of this bill. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] in a very graphic way, with a wave of his hand, said that, unarmed, the traveler could pass from the northernmost point of the island of Luzon through the Philippine Archipelago to the Sulu group in peace and safety; that these people were happy and comparatively prosperous. That has been the result, Mr. President, of the American occupation, of the sacrifices of our soldiers who fell there, of the expenditure of vast sums of our treasure which have been stated by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and others.

Mr. President, in the practice of the law, as is familiar to every lawyer, there is a plea known as the plea of confession and avoidance; there is a plea of *res adjudicata*; there is a plea of the statute of limitations or prescription. We can apply, Mr. President, in the argument upon this matter of State, the principles on which these pleas are based in the formal pleadings in a lawsuit. An analogous answer would be applicable to the proposition here now—to the proposal to unsettle a question which has been settled for 17 years, on which rights have been adjusted, upon which people have built their lives and adjusted their habits for the period of almost a generation. I want to discuss that feature of the matter a little later, in view of the insistence which has been placed in this debate upon the proposition that some promise has been given to the Philippine Islands which would bind the United States, after a long course of years of effort and expenditure there, to sever our relations with them and give up our sovereignty.

I can understand, Mr. President, the basis of the argument of those who insist that, in accordance with the fundamental principles of the American Government, we are not adapted to hold colonies, or to administer them, and that accordingly we ought to leave these islands. I can understand the argument of those, on the contrary, who say that these possessions having come under the jurisdiction and sovereignty of the United States as one of the unexpected incidents of an unexpected war, and we having become committed to their tenure and having made a success of their administration from our own standpoint and from that of the welfare of the Philippine people, we ought not to discuss the question of the abandonment of sovereign jurisdiction over them; but I can not understand the preamble of this bill or any policy which would justify it; that we should not abandon them; and, on the other hand, that we should not let the matter rest where it has rested for many years; but that we should continue to expend our lives and millions and hundreds of millions of dollars for an indefinite period in the future without hope of benefit to the American people, and when these expenditures have borne rich fruits to leave them all in the end. And, if you follow the argument of the advocates of the bill, it would also be without the possibility of benefit to the Philippine people, for it has been said time and time again that these people can not learn the principles of self-government so long as they are under our tutelage. Yet it is proposed to keep them under our tutelage for an indefinite period and then to relinquish our jurisdiction over them. That is the principal objection which I have to the measure. The preamble is more important than the enacting sections.

I should dislike very much, Mr. President, to be misunderstood as to my position toward the people of the Philippine Islands. I do not think there is anyone who would go further than I am willing to go in giving them self-government. I do

not know that I would have any objection to that portion of this bill which deals with the internal administration of their government; but, for the very reason that I want to see these people led up and on toward the full fruition of self-government, I am opposed to the unsettlement of their international relations and of the tie which binds them to the United States, because I believe that it would defeat the purpose and the object of self-government. That is one of the reasons why I am opposed to the preamble of this measure.

Suppose we were to abandon them to-day, Mr. President, and absolutely sever this intangible tie by which the sovereignty of this great Republic attaches itself to them. I think there are some Senators here who believe that they would have self-government. I am aware of the fact that it is said by many that it is none of our business what they would do after we sever our relations, and that is quite logical. It is not, however, the position of the preamble of the bill. But, nevertheless, even though there are Senators who say that it is none of our business, it is an important phase of this matter which ought to be considered. My opinion is that it is our business, and the very Senators who say that it is none of our business refute their own argument when they talk about going on year after year and spending millions of dollars to give them, among other things, and only one among other things, a common language. If it is none of our business what condition those people should be in and will be in when the protection of the United States is withdrawn, why should we go on for a single day? Why should we negotiate treaties with foreign powers to neutralize the islands? What business is it of ours? That is what Senators say. Oh, Mr. President, it is some of our business; and I am impelled to say so, notwithstanding my belief that there are in the Philippine Islands a large number of people who are more cultured in many respects than we are. They have better manners than we have and are more polite, and that is a great thing. I think it was Montesquieu who said, "Commerce goes to those nations whose people are polite." It is a national asset—their culture, their education, their refinement of manner; but is that the Philippine people?

There has been some discussion here as to the meaning of self-government. I mean by self-government, Mr. President, that kind of government which was described by Webster and formulated by Lincoln as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Now, the Philippine people, as a people, will never have, in my judgment, that kind of a government when the United States pulls down its flag, which is the token of its sovereignty there, and takes away its restraining influence. The great interest which I have in the condition of the Philippine people is the same interest I have in the people of this country—not of a favored few, who in every country exist and can take care of themselves, but in the condition of the masses of their population. If American sovereignty were withdrawn from the Philippine Islands, civil war would break out. Between the so-called non-Christian peoples and the Christian peoples, between the wild tribes, so called, and the civilized tribes, there is undying unfriendliness. Time after time the Moros have boasted that, given the opportunity, taking away the obstruction of the United States, they would conquer the Filipino people.

This order which is described, and which exists, this peace, this security of person and life and property in the Philippine Islands, was not wrought out by themselves; but it was established there in the first place—as is almost always the case wherever a government has established order and security—by force of arms, then by the knowledge and the capacity of self-government existing in the United States backed up by military force. That is how they obtained it.

Pictures have been drawn of massacres and of horrors that attended the suppression of the Philippine insurrection. One Senator said that a number of Filipinos had congregated in a crater, and men, women, and children were massacred. I do not know what the purpose was in dragging that incident, whatever the circumstances may have been, into this debate. It was an incident, if it ever occurred, of the ordeal through which this country and the Philippines went when we undertook to establish peace and order there. But having established it, having paid that price for this result, does it follow that because it cost us that price, because horrors were attendant upon their acquisition, after they have been forgotten, after these people—a large portion of them, at least—have come to realize the material benefits, at least, which come from the government and sovereignty of the United States, we are to undo all of that?

Mr. President, there were two occasions when the question of the relation of the Government of the United States to the Philippine people might, under a wise policy, have been determined. One of them was when the question was presented of going to

war with Spain. All of these problems grow out of the War with Spain; they are the aftermath of that war; they are burdens and responsibilities which, perhaps, were foreseen by President McKinley and which caused him to refrain, in the face of the insistent and passionate demand of the American people, from plunging this country into that war. But having gone into the war, this question, the Cuban question, and many other problems with which we have been burdened since, and the responsibilities of which we have borne with credit to ourselves, I am glad to say, became fixed upon us.

There was another time when we sensibly could have determined the question of our relations to the Philippines, and that was when the Spanish fleet had been destroyed in Manila Bay by Admiral Dewey. I heard some Senator describing in conversation the regret of Senator Hale, I think, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, when there was submitted to the council of officials of this Government the telegram to Admiral Dewey to proceed from Hongkong to Manila and destroy the Spanish Fleet, that he did not think of adding four words to the telegram—"and return to Hongkong." He expressed the opinion that if the suggestion had been adopted, and that course pursued, we would not have acquired the Philippines; and consequently we would not now—17 years afterwards—after the horrors which have been described, and the billions of dollars that have been expended—I think that is an exaggeration, but taking the estimates of Senators, probably a billion dollars, according to the estimates of some of them, first and last, directly and indirectly—we would not now, here in the Senate of the United States, be talking about undoing it all, abandoning it, and putting the Filipino people and the United States of America back where they were when the War with Spain was declared, or at least where they were when the insurrection began in those islands. And that reminds me—

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. In just one moment I will yield to the Senator. That reminds me that many Senators discuss this question as though we had imposed an arbitrary sovereignty upon a free people. Why, that is not the case. That is not borne out by history. We substituted the sovereignty of this free Republic for the oppressive Government of Spain in those islands. We have taken nothing of self-government away from the Philippine people, but we have given them more than they ever would have gained if they had never heard of the United States.

I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. I was simply going to add something to the historical value, perhaps, of the incident to which the Senator refers. Senator Hale told the incident partially to illustrate how easy it is for men of experience, temporarily vested with the control of things, to make a mistake. The Senator was always very bitterly opposed to the acquisition of over-sea territory, and the incident has some value in view of the fact that there it was, at least from his viewpoint, in the power of a man who was opposed to something to secure the adoption of a certain course of action, instead of which he failed at a critical moment to take advantage of the opportunity along the line of his own inclinations, for Senator Hale stated that if he had added the four additional words he did not think a member of the party would have objected to it. There it was in the power of the man to do something along the line of his inclinations, and yet at that moment he forgot to interpose and to add the words.

Mr. POINDEXTER. And yet, if I am not mistaken, Senator Hale subsequently, after the matter had become fixed and had taken on a new phase, voted against the evacuation of the islands by the United States.

Mr. CLAPP. Oh, certainly. While the question of our supremacy was involved he was in favor of establishing the supremacy of the American arms.

Mr. POINDEXTER. But the statement which he made, and which has been so clearly described by the Senator from Minnesota, illustrates the distinction which Senator Hale made between the decision of the question before we had committed ourselves to the policy of occupying the islands and its decision after we had occupied them and had governed our course of action upon that occupation.

Mr. President, I suppose the best form of government which a people can have, eliminating from consideration abuses of administration, is that form of government to which they are accustomed. It is sometimes said that the sweetest word in the English language is "home," and I have reflected somewhat as to why that is. Many homes that we see are not more attractive than others around them, perhaps not nearly so attractive. A wanderer upon the face of the earth may be amid beauties of every kind of nature and of art, and yet we commiserate him as the most miserable of mortals because he is a wanderer. The

pleasure and the attractions of home are based upon the familiarity of its occupant with his surroundings. It is because he is used to it. Man is like other animals in that respect. A dog or a cat or a horse will return from long distances and after long periods of time to the place to which it is accustomed, not because it is better than other places, but because the sensibilities of nature and of human nature yield to contact with their environment and they are easy and comfortable in the place and under the conditions to which they are accustomed.

I venture to say that the people of the Philippine Islands, after 17 years of American occupation, are becoming accustomed to that occupation. I venture to say that if it were possible to get the real sentiment of the great masses of the people of those islands and search the innermost recesses of their souls they would say, with all the impulses of their nature, that this occupation has been a blessing to them. If it should be submitted to the people of those islands in the proper sense, referring to the great masses of the people, I do not believe they would want to change that relation. They have experienced its benefits. They are looking forward to greater benefits which are to come; and while they may not know it, we know, or we ought to know from the teachings of the founders of our Republic, that it is unwise to unsettle the governmental relations of people. It is set forth in the Declaration of Independence. Men will bear the ills they have rather than fly to those they know not of.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. Before the Senator altogether leaves the phase of this question which he was discussing just before he was interrupted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], and which is very interesting to me, I wish to ask him a question with respect to his views upon an aspect of that subject.

The Senator had just stated—and stated truthfully, I think—that during our occupation of the Philippines we have taken nothing from those people, but that we have given them much of great value. We have, at large expense to ourselves, helped to initiate them into the methods of self-government. At large expense to ourselves we have helped them to establish schools, and with our help they have made very great progress in the direction of the education of the masses of the people. We have helped them in matters of sanitation at considerable expense to ourselves. We have helped them in road building, and in other directions we have broadened the development of their natural resources.

Do I understand the Senator, in making these comments upon our gratuities to the people of those islands, to suggest that in withdrawing, if we should withdraw, as provided by the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARK], we shall withdraw without any suggestion to them or any demand upon them or any requirement upon them of any sort of financial indemnity to the United States for the large sums of money that it has spent there for the purpose of their betterment politically, socially, industrially, and economically?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there is nothing of that kind provided in this bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. There is nothing of that sort provided in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. I was desiring to elicit the views of the Senator from Washington as to whether, in case we do withdraw, we should do so unconditionally or whether we should require them to make us some sort of indemnity for the expenditures we have incurred for benefits to them which are permanent and perpetual.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Withdrawal, to be perfectly frank with the Senator from North Carolina, from the Philippine Islands now, whatever might have been right and wise 10 years ago, seems to me a stupendous mistake from every possible standpoint, and it is difficult for me to address myself to a consideration of the question which the Senator from North Carolina has stated. It is not agreeable to me to contemplate a business dicker with those poor people for a return to the Government of the United States of the vast sums of money which it is stated—as I said before, I think it is exaggerated—we have invested there. I do not know what the views of the Senator from North Carolina might be as to the means by which we could collect the returns for this great investment.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. POINDEXTER. My opinion is that it would be extremely difficult to the Filipino people ever to pay the United States for the money we have invested there, and they could never pay us for the lives which have been sacrificed or for the labor which has been expended by Americans in building up the government which they now have.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, I have not expressed any opinion with respect to the matter that I brought to the attention of the Senator. I could not say that I have any well-formulated opinion upon the subject. The Senator was discussing the subject of the expenditure on the part of the United States for their benefit, and I wanted to inquire of the Senator if, in discussing it, he had in view the idea that in case we did withdraw, as provided in the amendment to which I understand he is addressing himself, we should demand compensation.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is not only the amendment, Mr. President, to which I am addressing myself, but it is the bill itself, which is far more important in its prologue, as some dramas are said to be, than is the drama itself. This proposition, which involves the destiny of 8,000,000 people and the interest of all the people of the United States, is the adjustment of the relations between those islands and this country.

It was both those propositions to which I was addressing myself, and the reason why I suggested the amount which has been expended in the Philippine Islands was to call to the attention of the Senate that this was only one of the conditions which had become fixed and which had grown out of our occupancy of the islands, which rendered an evacuation now unreasonable, made it difficult to readjust to these conditions, and that we should have determined the question earlier. I shall point out in a moment that we did determine it earlier, and that it should not now be questioned after these sums have been expended—and I regard the funds which have been expended as the least which we have given to those islands. We have given our genius, we have given our knowledge of building roads, we have given the ability of our physicians to establish sanitary conditions, we have reduced the death rate, we have reduced the illiteracy of those islands. That grew in part out of the expenditure of this money. It grew also in part, and in far greater part, out of the knowledge, the capacity, the devotion, and the self-sacrifice of the people of the United States.

I want, Mr. President, in the discussion of this question to depart from that policy which seems of late years to have governed so many of our foreign relations, as in the Panama Canal, for instance, and to consider not only the welfare of foreign people but to consider as a part of the equation which is to be solved the interests of our own people.

Now, Mr. President, should we come to the proposition of abandoning the islands—pulling down our flag? I have no objection to pulling down the flag if it represents the policy which is to be adopted, but if we are to adopt that policy there are many questions, not only the one which the Senator from North Carolina suggests; there is the question of coaling stations for the use of the Navy, the question of making treaties with foreign countries for the neutralization of those islands, and a question which perhaps the Senator from North Carolina has not thought of, because he says he has not come to a conclusion upon the one which he mentioned—and which I doubt has been thought of by any of the advocates of that policy—and that is, when we have made neutralization treaties for the Philippine Islands are we prepared when we sever our relations with them to plunge into international war to maintain the treaties which we have signed? That is a question which will have to be answered, and if not answered now it will have to be answered hereafter.

One of the great responsibilities of legislation in this great tribunal is that what we do every day not only affects the interests of ourselves and of this generation, but in the laws which we pass we affect the woe or the welfare of generations that are to come. Are we going to saddle upon the next generation the responsibility of plunging this country into a great war or else of dishonoring itself by abandoning its treaty obligations because we have entered into a treaty with foreign countries for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands?

I should like Senators to give me their views about that. I know that there is an element which would say that we would arbitrate it, but suppose the other fellow would not arbitrate it, as has been said by quite a noted American on another occasion. I heard a great American speak in my State last summer, in which he said that if modern naval vessels and transports with armed troops came to invade this country we would go out to meet them and say, "We have the lives of 100,000,000 people to protect and priceless ideals to preserve for the benefit of mankind." He seemed to be of the opinion that, when we said that, that would settle it, and the fleet would turn back and the transports would return to the country from which they came. But that is not in accordance with common sense. That is ideally beautiful; it is theoretically perhaps defensible upon some high plane of brotherly love; but we all know that international relations are not, in our time at least, and, so far as I can see,

will be at no time in the near future, determined by principles of brotherly love.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. POINDEXTER. In just one moment. Whether we would like it or not, whether we would like to put it upon that basis, however much our virtue might be in evidence, if it should be, our great rivals do not, as a matter of fact, adjust their foreign relations upon any such high principles. On the contrary, it can not be denied that matters of self-interest govern. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Washington has very sagaciously called our attention to the real significance and possible consequence of a treaty by which the neutralization of the Philippine Islands would be guaranteed. Is not the same obligation and the same responsibility involved in the suggestion lately made of a treaty of alliance offensive and defensive with the Republics of America?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It might be, Mr. President, unless it was guarded against by some proviso in the treaty. I do not know that that proposal has been worked out to any definite form. It does not follow, if the Senator proposes to make that the basis of removing the difficulty of a Philippine treaty for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands, which I mentioned, that it can be used for that purpose at all. I do not know, so far as I am concerned, that a treaty of offense or defense with a great number of any foreign countries in the Western or Eastern Hemisphere would be wise.

Mr. WALSH. There is one other suggestion which has been repeatedly offered as a solution for war trouble, that the nations of the earth ought to band themselves together and agree jointly to use coercive measures with respect to any single nation that might engage in war. Such an engagement would likewise involve us in the same kind of responsibility and obligation as a treaty of neutralization.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The only difference is, Mr. President, that it is more extensive. There would be more opportunities for trouble. There would be more consequences involved in it.

Mr. WALSH. I merely desired to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that there is a general principle involved in any obligation of the Government with respect to the future.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is very true, but while there are general principles involved the neutralization of any country is not necessarily one of them; and even though it were, and if it were true, as the Senator seemed to intimate, that such treaties might furnish a cause for war, it does not follow that we should add to that difficulty by assuming a protectorate through neutralization treaties or otherwise over the Philippine Islands. I think one of the most illogical features, and there are many of them, of any of the proposals which have been made in regard to the Philippine Islands is that we should absolutely surrender our sovereignty and yet guarantee their independence. Three or four different times the National Democratic Party in its platform has proposed it. It is not proposed in this bill; it is not said by Senators defending the bill what the plans or purposes of their party are in regard to that, but of course, in view of the rigid adherence to other planks of their platform, they will abide by this one.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield further to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. Such a treaty of neutralization would impose no heavier obligation upon the United States to engage in war in case of its violation than it would upon any other signatory power?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It might not. That would not help us very much.

Mr. LIPPITT. I would like to ask the Senator if he does not think, under the peculiar circumstances of our connection with the Philippines, a treaty negotiated by us of the neutralization of those islands would involve us in some additional responsibility in case of a violation as compared with other nations of the world. There certainly would be a moral obligation on our part—considering the relations we have already assumed with those islands and considering the fact that such a treaty, if it was signed, would have been through negotiations of ours—to defend, to protect, and to take armed measures in case of a violation of it. It would seem to me that that would be involved.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Why should we assume that burden? If we are to sever our relations with the Philippine Islands why should we bother ourselves and sacrifice our people's lives and pay out the taxes which have been ground out of them to protect the Filipinos? Why not go and protect the Chinese?

Mr. LIPPITT. If I may be allowed a word further, I do not for a minute assume that that could be a desirable course for us to pursue, but the Senator from Montana suggested that it would involve some more responsibility on our part than it would on the part of any other signatory power. It seems to me that it would.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that the Philippine question being our question, we being the proponents of the proposed treaty, and we being in the attitude of plaintiff, so to speak, and the other parties defendants, the treaty being formed with the idea that we were not going to interfere with the independence of the Philippines, because we would be giving it up, and the treaties being framed to prevent some other country from interfering with their independence, that much greater burdens and responsibilities would be placed upon us than upon the other parties to the treaty.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield further to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has been very kind in yielding. Let me ask him if this is not the situation, exactly: If we retained possession of the Philippines and any nation attempted to take them we would of necessity be involved in war with that nation without being able to call upon any other nation to assist us. If we surrender the possession and enter into a treaty with all the nations of the earth for the neutralization of the islands it may be, and undoubtedly would be, our duty to defend them by force of arms, but we could then call upon all the other signatory powers to help us. In other words, we lessen, do we not, the burden of the obligation?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It would be as hopeless as the prophets of Baal calling on the Lord to send down fire from heaven. The help would not come.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. All I was going to say is that just now there is not much dependence to be placed upon treaties.

Mr. WALSH. That is the unfortunate situation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. POINDEXTER. For a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like, with the permission of the Senator from Washington, to ask the Senator from Montana a question with reference to the observation he has just made.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If it does not take the Senator from Montana too long to answer it I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. SIMMONS. It will not take me long to ask it and I am sure that it will not take the Senator long to answer it. The Senator said it would probably be easier for us to defend the neutrality of the islands with the assistance of the other nations to the agreement of neutrality than it would be to defend them during our occupancy against invasion. That is probably true, but I notice in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, which we are now discussing, there is a provision that we invite other nations to join us in this work of guaranteeing the neutrality of the islands, but in case no nation will join us in that guaranty there is a provision that the United States shall guarantee the neutrality of the islands after we have retired. I will ask the Senator, if it should come to that, if we should evacuate the islands and become the sole guarantor of neutrality, would we not then be in a much worse position in order to defend that country against invasion than we are now while we are in the occupation of the islands?

Mr. WALSH. I should say obviously we would. I would not be able to give my assent to the amendment for that reason.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield in a moment to the Senator from Rhode Island. If the argument which has been made with so much eloquence by Senators in favor of this bill and this preamble, or of the amendment which the Senator from Arkansas introduced, is based upon the inalienable rights of people to manage their own affairs, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana and the Senator from North Carolina why we should make any treaty of neutralization for them?

Mr. WALSH. Why we should?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes. I was assuming that if the argument of the proponents of this measure and the amendment is correct, that it is one of the inalienable rights of people to manage their own affairs, and if superimposed sovereignty by a greater power can not benefit them in any way at all, why we

should impose ourselves upon them to the extent of making a neutralization treaty?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Montana has not been sponsor of that provision.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand he is not in favor of it, and I do not want to press the Senator; I am just anxious to have his view about that.

Mr. WALSH. I think we should make an agreement if we can.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course the Senator need not answer unless he desires, but I will ask him out of what duty would such an act on our part grow? Why should we make such a treaty?

Mr. WALSH. I would like to relieve, so far as we possibly can, the Philippine people and any other people on earth from the evils of war. We have had such an example within the last year. It is my opinion that they would be very much less likely to be made the subject of foreign aggression if the whole world were leagued to preserve their independence. I should think it altogether unlikely under those circumstances that any nation would attempt to fight them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator would be a long ways from the doctrines of George Washington, also of Thomas Jefferson and many of the leaders of the old Democratic Party to go so far afield as that and entangle ourselves in international agreements, out of which he admits war might come.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. COLT. If I may be permitted to ask the Senator from Montana a question, it would be in this line: Whether at the present time, when most of the great nations who are interested in the Far East are suffering from the delirium of war, the Senate of the United States should pass the Clarke amendment, which calls upon the President to enter into an agreement, pledging the independence of the Philippines, and whether he thinks these nations at this time would be willing to enter into any such guaranty?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I cheerfully answer the question of the Senator from Rhode Island. My opinion about the matter is that the present is an inopportune time to engage in any negotiations looking to a treaty of that character.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish just a moment.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield in a moment to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish merely to say a word.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire simply to say to the Senator from Washington, that if he is laboring under the impression that I have committed myself to this amendment in that way he is laboring under an erroneous impression. I have not committed myself to it. I am listening to the argument. I am studying the question. I do believe and always have believed—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I hope the Senator will not commit himself to it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I beg pardon; I did not catch his remark.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I say I hope the Senator from North Carolina will not commit himself to the proposition of guaranteeing the independence of the islands and entering into treaties for that purpose.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was going to add to what I have said that I have always believed that as soon as it was wise and just to ourselves and to the Filipinos we ought to retire from the islands and give them an opportunity to govern themselves. I still feel that way about it. I believe when we do retire it would be a wise thing for us to provide for some international system of guaranteeing the sovereignty of those people, because I very much fear unless it be done that as soon as we get out of the way they will be the prey of some designing powers of the earth. But while I feel that way about it, I am not at all prepared to give my assent to this amendment. I am considering and studying the matter, listening to the discussion; but at this time I am not prepared to give my assent to the provision.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am encouraged to know that, Mr. President, because I think the counsel of the Senator from North Carolina on the other side will have great weight. My own opinion is that while the Senator says he is not in favor of entering into treaties, his subsequent remark that he is in favor of entering into some sort of international arrangement

guaranteeing independence amounts to the same thing, and that undoubtedly it would lead us to a continuous series of difficulties and to war if we adopted it, owing to the responsibility which we would necessarily assume, regardless of the form which the agreement took, because the Senator is correct in saying that other nations would look upon the islands with covetous eyes. Other nations need them. Some nations need the undeveloped rice fields of the Philippine Islands to support their overcrowded population. Now, if we undertake to guarantee independence, we have got to meet that contingency.

Mr. President, if we propose to commit ourselves to the proposition of abandoning the Philippine Islands we ought to do it to-day; we ought to get out of the islands as soon as it is physically possible for us to get out of them. I can quote the argument of a dozen Senators on the other side to prove that we are under no obligation to remain there a day longer to educate them or to preserve their independence or for any other purpose. We ought either to be there or not to be there. If we are there, we ought to give them self-government, a good government, and we ought to exercise such sovereignty and jurisdiction over them as will enable us to do that; else we should leave at once.

However, Mr. President, should we pursue such a policy, within a very few months the people of the islands would be engaged in civil war. Instead of being a Philippine republic or a Philippine monarchy, there would be a large number of Philippine nations. Every local leader who chafed at the restraint of some national regulation which interfered with his interest would defy that restraint, and there would be independent governments set up in every island of any importance and perhaps in different portions of the larger islands of the archipelago.

Self-government reduced to its ultimate analysis means the capacity of the individual to submit to law; and the reason why so many of the Latin American colonies—not all of them, but many of them—have been in a constant state of disorder and violence is the lack of that individual quality on the part of their people.

A rule by violence, a medieval system—

Let him take who has the power,
And let him keep who can—

would soon be established in the archipelago. So far from having freedom or individual liberty or self-government, a state of virtual slavery, a condition of gradually increasing peonage, would oppress the masses of the people of those islands, just as it has for generations ground down in pitiful bondage the masses of the people of Mexico. They would be the subject of exploitation of the so-called politicians. They have no knowledge, if one is to believe the statements of disinterested and well-informed and competent observers, of what independence means. There is no desire upon the part of their leaders to educate the masses, but, on the contrary, the policy is much like that of Spain—to keep them in a state of ignorance, in order to keep them in a state of subjection.

There can be independence, Mr. President, without self-government, and, in my judgment, independence in this case would make self-government impossible. On the other hand, there can be self-government without independence; and there are many concrete illustrations of both those propositions. When the great war between the British Empire and the Boers was on—if the Senate will pardon a personal reference, my sympathies were very strongly with the Boers. I looked upon them as a people who had been imposed upon, as a brave and courageous people, capable of self-government, who were being oppressed; but that question was settled the other way.

The power of Great Britain, not by conquering their armed soldiers in the field—for they did not do that—but by overrunning their country and concentrating their women and children in camps, threatening the entire race with extermination, imposed the superior might of its Government upon them by military force. To-day, Mr. President, after the lapse of years, just as there have been the changes of years in the case of the Philippine Islands—I have no feeling that the former Boer Republics are being oppressed or that they are being deprived of self-government. When I witness the advance that has taken place there, when I read of men who had committed an offense punishable with death—treason to the Empire—surrendered to their former compatriots to be dealt with as they saw fit, and, after a brief incarceration, given their liberty, I realize, as never before, that, while they may not have independence, and the tie of sovereignty to the British Empire is not released, they have self-government in the fullest and best sense of the word.

It is so, Mr. President, with our great and magnificent neighbor on the north, the self-governing Dominion of Canada; it is so with Australia, bound to the British Empire not by laws

that oppress and compel their support but rendering in this time of the need of their mother country their full measure of men and means through the love which they bear to a country which gives them security, international peace, and individual liberty.

On the other hand, Mr. President—and this is the question which is involved in the preamble of this resolution—I see a country to the south of us which has independence. The so-called Republic of Mexico is a sovereign Republic, and yet the priceless privileges of self-government, a word which has been used so often in the course of this debate, and something which Senators are so eagerly seeking to give to the Filipinos, as though they did not have it in great extent now, is unknown in Mexico.

I witnessed the other day a Senator put into the RECORD the constitution that had been prepared under the Aguinaldo government, and he eulogized it as a beautiful expression of the principles of self-government and a proof of the ability of those people to understand and adopt it. Why, Mr. President, you can read in the laws of Mexico a constitution that is freer than that of the United States; but it is not the documents which a few men, sincere or insincere, in their drawing-rooms can frame and publish that is to determine whether a people are capable of self-government or whether they possess it; it is the use which they make of their opportunities. The proof is in the administration of the law. While Mexico is a free Republic on paper, it has for a generation been a military dictatorship in fact. For some five or six years it has been a hotbed of lawlessness, violence, and anarchy, of disregard for the rights of personal liberty, of life, and of property of their own people, as well as of the citizens of other countries who had been invited there on lawful missions of peace.

Mr. President, we know that we may give to the people of the Philippine Islands—and I mean no affront to them; I know the differences between those people and the Mexican people; they are an entirely different people—the same measure of independence which Mexico had; and, in a few years, although there will be many earnest souls there who will ardently desire it, they will have no more individual security and no more government of, by, and for the people than has Mexico.

Mr. President, if the object of this bill is, through the mistaken means of independence, to give self-government to these people, I agree that there can be no higher object. I know that the Magna Charta is as great a document, in the long course by which we won the blessings of liberty, as the Declaration of Independence; I know that the security of person, the dignity and self-respect which come from the guaranties of that instrument, which won a large measure of self-government in the island of Britain, are, in fact the ultimate objects which the patriots of our war for independence had in severing our relations with England; but unless they had had a capacity to establish on these shores those same individual privileges and rights which English subjects enjoyed in the mother country, they would never have framed nor ever have adopted a Declaration of Independence, because it would have been a fruitless labor.

I should like Senators to reflect, while they may talk about the fundamental principles of government and the inalienable rights of man, of which Rousseau and Tom Paine spoke, that there are some practical circumstances to be considered here and to be put ahead of academic reasoning and of abstract ideals and impossible theories, namely, the plain middle-of-the-day facts and conditions with which we are dealing. After we build up a government in the Philippine Islands and those people have adjusted themselves to it during a course of years, and laws have been made and enforced and the people have become accustomed to them, can you imagine anything more without reason or any foundation of solid judgment than to say we must now go back and examine Rousseau and Tom Paine and see what they said and find out whether or not the principles enunciated by them are in force in the Philippine Islands? If we are to found a government, Mr. President, we desire all the inalienable rights of man that are consistent with peace and order and good government to be embedded in its law; but when that government is founded, we must proceed with such means as may be adapted to the conditions which exist.

For one, I would not have acquired the Philippine Islands. Having some sense of the complex problems that would grow out of the War with Spain—and this is one of them, though I do not claim to have foreseen this identical question, except that in a vague way I apprehended similar problems—I felt that we ought not to have gone into that war; but after we had gone into the islands, I confess that when the question arose in 1900 of whether we should abandon them, I thought that, having expended our blood and treasure for them, we ought to keep them.

Mr. President, we might have considered then the fundamental rights of man and the fundamental principles which ought to be incorporated in the constitution of a State, but the time is very different now. These people are happy and contented; peace and order prevail; they have the growing blessings of education and increasing opportunities in business and for bettering their condition and relieving themselves from the servitude of absolute poverty. Under such conditions, to say that, because there is a doctrine that no man shall be governed without his consent, government ought to be overthrown, if applied in this country, would result immediately in disorder and rebellion even in the United States.

Why, Mr. President, when one of the Senators who is advocating the abandonment of all these great results of our occupation of the Philippines was a small boy—I do not think he was old enough to take part in the struggle—his father and relatives—and I may say my father—were engaged in one of the greatest struggles that mankind ever engaged in for the independence of Mississippi and Virginia, as a part of the Confederacy, from the Federal Union. No people could have given more for the faith that was in them than they gave. I am as fully aware as is the Senator from Mississippi, and understand just as well their devotion to that cause. The feelings it aroused still occasionally flare up after all these years. For four years they carried on that war, until they were exhausted in men, in treasure, prostrate before a superior power, resentful, hostile in their feelings toward the Federal Government; but now years have gone on, conditions have evolved from that state of chaos in which the South was left at the close of the war, and I do not think I make a mistake when I say that if you searched the innermost consciousness of the Senator from Mississippi and had him answer upon it he would not change to-day the relations which exist between his State and this great Republic; that he would not, if it were given to him to choose, have that independence for which his fathers fought.

So, Mr. President, after we have fought, after we have expended our genius and our time in the government of the Philippine Islands in building up there a self-governing dependency, the mass of the Filipinos would not go back to the conditions that existed before we went there.

I do not think any excuse can be given for such a provision as is incorporated in this bill under which, though we stay there, at some unknown time in the future, under conditions which no man can foresee as to the Filipinos or as to ourselves, we shall find ourselves bound by a solemn legislative promise that we will come away and sever our relations with them. If that is statesmanship, then the great statesmen of the world have been misrepresented.

Now, it is said, Mr. President—and I want briefly to discuss another phase of the question—that we can not take up this matter ab initio, because binding promises have been given to the Philippine people which raised certain expectations among them which it would now be immoral to disappoint. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Lippitt] has already discussed, I think, very conclusively the facts as to whether any such promises were given by any of our administrative executive officers. I do not think anything was said by them which, upon reasonable interpretation, could have been held to guarantee that we would evacuate the islands, whatever might have been said by them as to an autonomous form of government, which is rather a vague form.

I am in favor of an autonomous form of government as rapidly as it can be developed, so far as their internal affairs are concerned, and their internal affairs, mind you, are the same as their national affairs; if they get independence it covers the entire archipelago. I am willing for them to govern those things, and it may be that some of the expressions of American officials led them to expect that would be evolved. But, Mr. President, regardless of whether or not the expressions justified that interpretation, is it to be contended here that the American people have been deprived of the essential power over their government to determine this question for themselves through their Representatives in Congress? No. Is there any sophistry of argument by which it could be held that Mr. Taft or Mr. Francis Burton Harrison or anybody else who may have assumed such powers of government in the Philippine Islands have fixed their status by some individual declaration they may have made? Of course not, Mr. President. The proposition is absolutely absurd. They had no right to do so. The intelligent Filipino people knew they had no right to bind this Government; that it was a matter of congressional action. No belief that the question was precluded or concluded in any way could legitimately have arisen from those declarations, whatever they may have been, even though they went further than the Senator from Rhode Island has shown.

Mr. President, the fact of the case is that, so far from having bound ourselves to sever our relations with the islands and give them complete independence, and so far as it was possible for any past administration to bind this Government upon the question at all, we have informed the Filipino people by our action upon the question of independence that we proposed to retain the ultimate sovereignty over the islands. That is a statement of fact, and I want to briefly demonstrate that it is correct.

I mentioned a moment ago that in 1900 one of Mr. Bryan's issues—I think the "paramount issue," as he expressed it in that campaign—the Senator from Colorado will know if I am correct—was the Philippine question, or imperialism, as it was called.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I think that was regarded by Mr. Bryan as the paramount issue in that campaign.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator will allow me, it was not only regarded personally by Mr. Bryan as the paramount issue in that campaign, but it was distinctly so stated in the platform adopted by the Democratic convention of that year.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is certainly true, Mr. President, and I was going to call attention to the fact that it was submitted for decision to the highest tribunal known to our form of government for the settlement of general policies of this kind, namely the American people. This platform of the Democratic Party declared in 1900:

We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to give the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and third, protection from outside interference.

If that platform is to be carried out in this bill, not satisfied with the burdens that we have assumed under the Monroe doctrine in the Americas, we will establish something analogous to it in Asia, among people who are so alien to our system of government that the Senator from Mississippi says we can never reconcile them to it.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield in just a moment. I was just going to state, to complete the sentence, that the Democratic issue which was submitted to the American people by the Democratic platform of that year—and I am going to call attention to some other features of it a little later—made the rather Quixotic proposal that we should have no interest in the Philippine Islands; that we should abandon our sovereignty over them, and yet we should not allow any other nation to go in there at all; it would be our business in case we abandoned them to prevent any other nation from going there.

Mr. GALLINGER. And to fight to prevent them going there.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I wanted to call the Senator's attention to the fact—although the Senator has referred to it already—that the effect of the Democratic platform was equivalent to this, "We will give you independence with an American protectorate."

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. NELSON. It was proposed that we should continue there as their protector, as their guardian.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Exactly.

Mr. NELSON. They were to have independence under those conditions.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That was exactly what was proposed, a proposal which, as I have said, would extend something analogous to the Monroe doctrine, which was supposed to be confined to the Western Hemisphere, into the Orient, and undertake to say to other countries—at least to this extent it was analogous to the Monroe doctrine—"you shall not colonize in the Philippine Islands or acquire territory there without their consent." Inevitably, Mr. President, that would have involved us in war, if we had undertaken to maintain it, and would have done so before now had independence been granted.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator if he took the Democratic platform seriously? It seems to me he is wasting time, because nobody else took it in that way, not even the Democrats,

Mr. POINDEXTER. Except for the purposes of debate. That seems to be about the only use that is made of it. There are various reasons given for not living up to it—as in the case of the abandonment of their platform on the Panama Canal tolls question, that when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] read the platform there was so much noise in the convention hall that the delegates could not hear it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, in reference to the question as to the paramount issue in 1900, is it not also admitted by the Senator that while Mr. Bryan desired to make that the paramount issue, the New York papers would not let him, and that they claimed that he was in favor of free silver and thereby turned a great number of people in the East against him?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think that is true, Mr. President. Not only the New York papers would not let him, but the American people by a plurality of 849,790 would not let him. It was submitted to them and was decided against him. Of course the Senator's explanation in regard to the claim that Mr. Bryan was in favor of free silver is a good deal like the excuse I mentioned a moment ago about the Democratic platform at Baltimore. I know that there were other issues involved besides imperialism, but I do claim that was the paramount one, and, if our elections mean anything at all, if a public policy—and every national platform contains more than one question—can ever be determined in a general national election, this question was determined in that election, and the Philippine people knew it and took notice of it, or should have done so, any statement any executive officer made there to the contrary notwithstanding.

Practically the same proposition was again submitted very persistently in 1904. In that year the Democratic platform declared:

We insist that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now, and, upon suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal, set the Filipino people upon their feet, free and independent to work out their own destiny.

I can personally vouch for the fact that that issue was carried before the people upon the hustings and the decision of the people was 2,545,515 plurality against the proposition; and the Filipino people knew of that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator has read the platform of the Democratic Party for one year upon the Philippine question, and says that question was necessarily submitted to the people and the people decided against it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is right upon that. The people, when they decide against a party, are supposed to decide against the principles which the party avows and upon which it nominates its candidate for President. But in 1912 the Democratic Party again made a declaration with reference to the Philippines.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I can give the Senator the decision on that. The plurality of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft over Mr. Wilson in that election was 1,311,444.

Mr. SIMMONS. Still, President Wilson was elected according to the Constitution of the United States, and both Houses of Congress were elected according to the Constitution of the United States, and they are now all Democratic.

The declaration of the party in 1912 was to this effect:

We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

The Senator from Minnesota was therefore mistaken when he said that the Democratic Party proposed to exercise suzerainty over the islands. The declaration of the last platform, the platform upon which we came into power, the platform upon which we have a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House and a Democratic President, does not provide for any suzerainty over the Philippines. It simply provides that we will guarantee their independence, the independence of their government, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like, with the permission of the Senator from North Carolina, to ask him whether he considers

that there is anything in the bill now before the Senate that carries out the provisions of the platform as expressed by the convention of 1912?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think there is a declaration in the preamble of the bill.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that the platform specifies that independence is to be given when a stable government can be established, while the bill which is now under discussion specifies that independence shall be given when in the opinion of the United States it is for the permanent interest of the Filipino people. The proviso which constitutes the limitation on the bill and the limitation that is in the platform have no relation to each other in any way. In fact, if I may be allowed to say so, the bill is itself as foreign from the conditions on which the platform was based as many of the other methods and policies that the Democratic Party have adopted are different from their other platform utterances.

Mr. SIMMONS. The declaration in the preamble of the bill—that they shall be given their independence as soon as the well-being of the Philippine people will justify it—I think in itself implies that it is to be given when there is a stable government; because until there is a stable government, or until the people have reached such a stage of development and intelligence and education that they can establish a government in their own interest, to be operated for their own welfare, I do not think they are probably in a condition to establish a stable government. When they do, in that condition they have all the elements necessary to the establishment of a stable government. They can not establish a stable government—

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator from North Carolina is entirely—

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator will not permit me to finish a sentence. They can not establish a stable government in the Philippines until they are given an opportunity to establish a stable government. We are exercising such control and dominion over there as does not permit them either to establish for themselves a stable government or to demonstrate their ability to establish a stable government; but when they have reached that condition of intelligence, that condition of education, where it is reasonable to suppose that if permitted to establish a stable government they are in a condition and will be able to do it, then they have reached the requirements of the declaration in the Democratic platform.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I am very glad to hear the Senator make the last statement that he made, because he points out what is evident to any thoughtful person—that the Democratic platform as it was adopted by their convention and as it establishes the condition for independence of the Philippines is an absolutely illogical and impossible condition to conform to under any circumstances. It is manifestly true, as the Senator from North Carolina says, that it would be impossible for the Filipino people to demonstrate their ability to establish or to carry on a stable government so long as the United States continued to exercise its sovereignty over them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not care to interrupt the Senator's speech.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I simply wanted to inquire if the Senator expected to go on at any considerable length?

Mr. LIPPITT. I am very much obliged to the Senator for allowing me to interrupt him.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I agree with the point the Senator is making; and that, in my opinion, is one of the chief objections to this bill. The advocates of it argue, on the one hand, that we must give the Filipinos independence before they can fit themselves for self-government, and upon the other hand say that they will not give them independence until they are fitted for self-government. That is the inconsistency of the bill. The Senator from North Carolina is also wrong, I think, in regard to the platform of 1912 not committing the Democratic Party to guarantee the independence of the islands.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not say that. I said the platform of 1912 expressly committed the Democratic Party to guarantee the independence of the government of the islands, and that that was not a suzerainty; that it did not propose, as the Senator from Minnesota suggests, that this Government would continue to exercise suzerainty over them, but that it would continue to guarantee their independence against any nation seeking to overthrow their government.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the question whether or not guaranteeing their independence amounts to a suzerainty depends upon the definition of the word "suzerainty." I think, myself, that it does.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, have not nearly all the nations or great powers of the world guaranteed the integrity of the territory and the Government of China? As the result of the Boxer troubles there, all the great nations intervened; and after that trouble was overcome, and order was restored in China, they then withdrew and gave an international guaranty of the integrity of the territory and independence of the Government of China. Does the Senator contend that that was a suzerainty that the great nations of the earth set up over the territory of China and the Government of China?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think the Senator has stated accurately the language of the international agreement relative to China; but assuming that it was in substance as the Senator says, it would be, in my judgment, a form of suzerainty by the nations making the guaranty for the protection of China as against any other nation not a party to the agreement or against any one of them attempting to violate it. I think it would come within the meaning of "suzerainty," and might, of course, lead up to conflict between the nations so agreeing in case of its violation by one of them.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to ask the Senator whether it is contended, either by him or by the Senator from North Carolina, that there is anything in this bill that provides that our Government shall guarantee the independence of the Philippines after it is once established until the neutralization of the islands is secured by treaty with other powers, as stated in the Democratic platform of 1912?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator that while I have not examined the bill very carefully, I do not understand that in this particular bill there is any language providing for the guaranty of the independence of the government of the islands. There is in the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. SIMMONS. The bill, as I understand, contents itself with a declaration that so soon as an independent government is thought by this Government to be in the interest of the Philippines it is proposed to allow them that degree of liberty.

Mr. NORRIS. It is not claimed, then, as I understand, by the Senator from North Carolina or anyone else, that this bill is a full compliance with the declaration of the Democratic platform of 1912?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not think the bill assumes that the time for granting independence has arrived. I am speaking now of the bill itself, independently of the amendment. The bill does not assume that the time has arrived when the United States should retire from the islands and accord independence to the Filipinos. The amendment does assume that the time has arrived.

Mr. NORRIS. That being true, if the Senator from Washington will permit a further interruption, is it, then, the intention of the Senator from North Carolina that when independence is brought about there shall be coupled with it a proposition that the Government of the United States shall guarantee the independence of the islands until a treaty with the powers can be agreed upon regarding their independence?

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not a member of the Committee on the Philippines, and I speak only as an individual Senator; but it would be my desire that whenever this Government shall accord independence to the Filipinos, it shall at the same time guarantee them the independence of their government until their country can be properly neutralized and have the support of the powers of the world. That is the position I occupy with reference to this question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like very much to proceed, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is entitled to the floor.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield in just a moment. As particular attention has been directed to the Democratic platform of 1912, it may be well to point out this fact: I suppose the party who made the platform are back of this bill. It is reasonable to hold them responsible for it; and as the Senator has just said, the bill does not assume that the time has arrived to make a declaration in favor of Filipino independence. The Democratic convention, however, did assume that the time had arrived, and declared in favor of an immediate declaration.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Senator fails to differentiate between a declaration favoring the immediate passage of legislation giving them independence and an immediate declara-

tion that they should at some future time, when certain conditions have transpired, be awarded their independence. The platform declaration is not that the Democrats shall immediately accord to the Philippines independence of the United States. That is not the platform declaration. That seems to be the idea the Senator has in his mind, however.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; that is not my idea.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator seems to think the platform provides that we shall immediately accord to the Filipinos their independence. The language of the platform is as follows:

We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands—

When?—

as soon as a stable government can be established.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the bill attaches an entirely different condition. It leaves it entirely in the discretion of the United States—

when, in the judgment of the United States, it will be to the permanent interest of the people of the Philippine Islands—

An entirely different condition from anything that could be interpreted out of the platform.

Now, Mr. President, on this question of whether or not the Philippine people had any reason to feel that we had bound ourselves as a nation to grant them entire independence, I want very briefly to put in the RECORD the language of the Democratic platform of 1908, in which this declaration was contained:

We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

That issue was submitted to the people, and was decided against the Democratic Party by a plurality of 1,269,804 for Mr. Taft.

Those, however, were not the only occasions on which the American Nation committed itself upon this policy. The question was decided a number of times by a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate of the United States. When the treaty with Spain was presented to the Senate, Mr. Vest offered an amendment to it, as follows:

The United States, desiring that the people of the archipelago shall be enabled to establish a form of free government suitable to their condition and securing the rights of life, liberty, and property and the preservation of order and equal rights therein, assumes for the time being and to the end aforesaid the control of the archipelago so far as such control shall be needful for the purposes above stated, and will provide that the privileges accorded to Spain by Article IV and V of this treaty shall be enjoyed.

That was decided in the negative by a vote of 53 to 30 in the Senate of the United States on the 6th day of February, 1899.

Everybody remembers the diligence with which the identical discussion that has been carried on upon this bill was carried on throughout the country on the so-called issue of "imperialism" immediately after we had made the treaty with Spain. I remember the prominent part that Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, took in it. There was a gentleman named Edward Atkinson, a statistician, who was very prominent among the anti-imperialists. They were able men. All of this is like raking up bones from a sepulcher of dead issues. They have been decided and determined time and time again. Even though it should have been well at that time, as I have said, to decide against so-called imperialism, an entirely different question is presented now, after the lapse of years.

On the 6th day of February, 1899, Mr. Hoar moved to amend the joint resolution which was pending with regard to the Philippines by inserting after the word "islands," where it appeared the third time—that is, after the words "to make such disposition of said islands as will best promote the interests of the citizens of the United States and the inhabitants of the said islands"—the words "with the consent of the people thereof"—that is, with the consent of the people of the Philippine Islands—thus raising this identical question. It was submitted to a record vote on the motion of Mr. Aldrich to lay it on the table, which motion to lay it on the table prevailed by a vote of 45 against 34.

The issue was very persistently made in the Senate; and in view of the insistence with which the argument has been made here now that we have promised to give them independence, I am taking the time to put in the RECORD the proof that we not only have not promised to give independence but we have put ourselves officially on record in the only way we have ever taken any official action on this question—and this was official action, because it was a matter officially determined by the Senate in the exercise of its powers and jurisdiction—against the proposition of absolute independence, saving all the time, at least so far as I am concerned, the matter of self-government, for which I

shall vote, and which I hope to see developed for the people of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Hoar again moved to amend the resolution by inserting, after the words "United States," where they appeared the second time, the words "or to force a government on them against their will." Where the declaration in the resolution said:

Nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States—

He moved to amend by inserting the words "or to force a government on them against their will." On a motion to lay that amendment on the table, the motion to lay on the table prevailed by a vote of 46 against 30.

Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, one of the leading Senators of this body at that time, and at one time chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, moved to amend the resolution by inserting at the end the following:

Resolved further, That the United States hereby disclaim any disposition or intention to exercise permanent sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said islands—

The same identical question which is now before the Senate—and assert their determination, when a stable and independent government shall have been erected therein entitled, in the judgment of the Government of the United States, to recognition as such, to transfer to said government, upon terms which shall be reasonable and just, all rights secured under the cession by Spain, and to thereupon leave the government and control of the islands to their people.

There, Mr. President, was a statesmanlike proposition, supposing the policy of getting out was to be followed. He proposed to get out, not to get out, and at the same time to stay in—a logical impossibility. He proposed to leave the government and the control of the islands to their people. That question was voted on, and on the direct question of the passage of the resolution the yeas were 29 and the nays were 29. There was a tie vote in the Senate upon that resolution, which contains almost the same language as the preamble of this bill and attaches the same condition as to when their independence should be actually granted, and the Vice President cast the deciding vote against the resolution, thereby again officially declaring the policy of the United States on that issue.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. I simply wanted to ask whether that vote was a vote on the Bacon amendment or on the bill itself?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It was upon the adoption of the Bacon resolution.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If these votes in the Senate are so important as the Senator from Washington seems to think them, what would he say as to the vote which was taken in the House of Representatives last year, in the Sixty-third Congress, the Members of which were elected at the time of the election of 1912, when President Wilson was elected? The bill declaring in favor of Philippine independence as soon as a stable government could be established was passed in the House of Representatives by a vote of 34 to 1, there not being even a party division upon it.

If these votes in the Senate are to bind the American people, does not the Senator think the vote of the direct representatives of the people, elected under the platform which was expressed in the Democratic convention, would have some binding force to show that those representatives understood that the people meant to give the Filipinos independence?

Mr. POINDEXTER. On the contrary, Mr. President, strange as it may seem, it shows just the opposite. I think it did not have any binding force, because the Senate many years before, in its official capacity, declared just the opposite, and the House of Representatives did not consider it had any binding force. So you have to apply the same rule to the action taken by the House of Representatives. I am not contending that this action of the Senate had a binding force, because it has always been my contention that we not only ought not to undertake to bind the future of the United States in this matter, but that we had no power to do so. That has been the argument of the advocates of the bill, based upon the declarations of administrative officers. I have attempted to refute it by showing that it has been declared to the opposite effect, and those declarations are entitled to more weight in the consideration of this question than are the others.

One or two other phases of the question—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Right there, if the Senator will allow me—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not understand that anyone in this debate has taken the position that binding promises have been made, because nothing but an act of the Congress of the United States can absolutely bind. But the position they take is that the Governor General and the President of the United States have said certain things with relation to the independence of the Philippines, and the statement is here made, and it is contended upon our side that those promises are morally binding, because they represent high officials of the Government and that the world takes them as governmental promises. Now, I want to call the Senator's attention to one.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I hope the Senator will not go on at great length.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like the Senator's opinion as to this which I am going to read.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If it is not too long and does not take too much space.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will read just that and then yield. I want to read it, and I want to ask the Senator whether he thinks it ought to be considered as a governmental promise.

The President of the United States has charged me to deliver to you the following message on behalf of the Government of our country:

That was Gov. Gen. Harrison talking to the Philippine General Assembly.

We regard ourselves as trustees, acting not for the advantage of the United States but for the benefit of the people of the Philippine Islands.

Every step we take will be taken with a view to the ultimate independence of the islands and as a preparation for that independence; and we hope to move toward that end as rapidly as the safety and the permanent interests of the islands will permit. After each step taken experience will guide us to the next.

When a man sent to the Philippine Islands as the Governor General of the islands, addressing in their General Assembly representatives of the Philippine people, says "The President of the United States has charged me to deliver to you this message of independence," can it be possible to say there is no moral obligation there? I should like to have the Senator say whether he thinks that would imply a moral obligation?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think that it is impossible, Mr. President, for Mr. Burton Harrison to fix such an obligation upon the United States. I do not say that with any reflection upon Mr. Harrison. I know that he is a very honorable gentleman. I served in the House of Representatives with him and have a very high personal regard for him. But I say that in the nature of things, even though Governor General of the Philippine Islands, he could not deprive the people of the United States of the right to settle this question for themselves, and if he could fix a moral obligation upon them that is as binding as any other obligation, of course the result would be that it did deprive them of the right to settle it for themselves.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to his colleague?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JONES. I merely wanted to ask my colleague if he thought Gov. Gen. Harrison even assumed to do that? He says he is charged by the President. That was the message he was told to deliver to those people by the President himself. Does my colleague think that the President even could impose a moral obligation upon the people of the Philippines?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Undoubtedly not, Mr. President. The President of the United States knows perfectly well that he had no right to impose any sort of an obligation upon the people. He might have been in a general way representing his party. He is representing his own views about the matter, and of course his own views were entitled to great weight, but it did not constitute any obligation, moral or legal or otherwise, upon the people of the United States to carry it out. If it did, it would handicap them and deprive them of the free agency in this matter which, of course, they have.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I agree with the Senator from Washington that any utterance by the Governor General could not be taken at this time as imposing a moral obligation upon the people of the United States to do anything, but I want to ask the Senator if there has not been an implied promise? Has there not been an understanding from the day the American flag was planted on the Philippine Islands that independence would ultimately be given to those people?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Answering that question with the utmost frankness, Mr. President, and having been at a place where this question was quite near to us, on the Pacific Coast, and where public questions are probably as actively discussed as they are in any part of the country, my impression was that the opposite proposition had been established as a policy of the Government. I should like to say why. I am impressed with the memory of the issue of imperialism that was thrashed out before the country, and with the division of public sentiment upon that question, and with the fact that it was decided against those who wanted to withdraw from the Philippine Islands, or to make any declaration of withdrawal. The general impression, the public impression, in my vicinity, and I think it represented the general public impression of the country, was that we were to remain in the Philippine Islands, to give them self-government; that after the difficulties and bloodshed of restoring order and setting up a competent government all would be well, and the Philippine people themselves would be thoroughly satisfied.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Was not this the impression upon the Senator's mind, that to the argument of imperialism the answer was made that we made a mistake when we went there, but having gotten into the islands, having taken control of them, it was not fair to the Filipino, it was not fair to the people who have made investments there, to leave at this time, waiting until under the tutelage of the American Government the Filipinos might be qualified to maintain a government of their own?

I have heard, I think, for the first time any Senator or any student of this question announce that it was the purpose of the United States to hold those islands permanently. As a matter of fact, we have always contended that we were not going to hold them. We knew they were not fit for citizenship in this Republic. We did not desire that the Philippine Islands become States, because we did not want any more of that colored virus injected into the body politic, and we were only holding them there until such time as they might be qualified under the control of the United States Government to maintain a government of their own. Not such a Government as ours, but a government for themselves.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, we are under no responsibility to do that. The Senator can not point out in any principle, even of generosity and philanthropy toward a weaker people, any duty on the part of the United States to go to the other side of the world to maintain order and in a foreign country to put their country in good condition, to establish free government for a people knowing in advance that we were to retain no permanent interest there.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. Do not make a mistake. I have never thought that we had the moral right to hold those people. I have never had any sort of respect for the argument made in favor of holding them as long as we have done, but my understanding has always been that the advocates of holding the islands have only believed that we should hold them for such time as those people might be qualified under American instruction for self-government.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, that time never would arrive, according to the argument of the Senator from Mississippi, because I have heard the junior Senator from Mississippi very eloquently express the view that no people, being supported and guided by another government, would ever develop the capacity to take care of themselves. So you are looking for the gold in the rainbow. You are looking for something that is visionary.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am not looking to that, but I was just taking the argument those gentlemen have made who insisted on holding the islands. I do not think they were qualified.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator agrees with me at least to that extent. I think the most unreasonable proposition in this whole issue is the proposition to go on there after we have made up our minds to get out. If we have made up our minds to get out, as I said before, the sooner we do it the better.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator will pardon me, I think the time has arrived when we ought to get out, and I shall vote for such an amendment to the bill. I wish we could have gotten out yesterday.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The other day one of the Senators here—I think it was the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH]—asked if the Argentine Republic is not capable of self-government, if Chile is not capable of self-government. I think the Senator from Colorado would agree that neither the Argentine Republic nor the Republic of Chile would have had an opportunity for self-government but for the protection of the United States. I do not say that, Mr. President, with the intention of reflecting in any way upon the character or capacity of the people of those marvelous Republics of South America, any more than I would reflect upon the American people if I were to

say that, in my judgment, we should never have gained our independence but for the assistance of France at a critical time in our Revolutionary War. Something was said here the other day about the President being a man who had visions. There was a time when we were not so strong materially but much stronger spiritually as a nation than we are to-day when by a statesman who had vision indeed a great doctrine was promulgated which involved the safety of our own Republic and the integrity of every Latin American Republic on the hemisphere.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Now, to apply it to the Philippine Islands. If you withdraw, unless you do the illogical thing of giving them independence according to the Democratic platform, and yet protecting them, while you have no control over their action, their situation, if left alone, will not be comparable to that of Chile and Argentina under the protecting ægis of the Monroe doctrine during all their growth. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, when I asked the question as to whether the people of Argentina are capable of self-government I was discussing the question as to their ability for self-government by their own officers, and I referred to the fact that their illiteracy was fully as great as that of the Philippine Islands, that Brazil's was a great deal more, and that Chile's was about the same as that of the Philippine Islands. As to whether or not there should be a protectorate, or whether they would maintain their independence, failing to be subjugated by some other country, is an entirely different question. The proposition whether those people are capable of self-government or would become capable of self-government is for them to settle; it is not for us to settle; and on that account the fact that we had the Monroe doctrine in South America has nothing to do with their ability to maintain a government of their own or self-government except to the extent of interference from outside.

The Philippine people do not care for a suzerainty or a protectorate over them by the American Government. They say that no other nation that has ever attained its independence has ever asked for a protectorate of any kind or character, and that usually there is more danger from a protectorate on account of the iron-hand policy that might be invoked at some time than there is danger of being subjugated by some other country. Consequently the question which I was discussing was as to whether Argentina, Brazil, and Chile were capable of self-government by the passage of laws and the administration of laws within their own country. The question as to whether there should be a protectorate is an entirely different question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is a different question, Mr. President, but it is the same question which is involved in this bill. This bill proposes the absolute independence of the Philippine Islands, and not only self-government in their internal affairs. I think I said in the beginning of my remarks that I would vote for a large degree of local self-government. That matter can be adjusted, even though mistakes are made in the trial of it. I am in favor of it. I should like to see the experiment.

The Senator says that is a different question from the question in Argentina and Chile, but the objection which we have to this bill is the preamble which proposes to give independence.

Since the Senator cited Chile and Argentina as a comparison, if we give the Philippines independence and do not assume a protectorate over them, there will be no such opportunity there as Chile and Argentina have had, either for maintaining independence or for developing self-government. Some foreign country—and I have heard it admitted this afternoon by Senators on the other side—would occupy the land. Many of the leading Filipinos have expressed the opinion that if the United States should withdraw its protection Europe would divide up the islands. It might not be Europe; it might be some Asiatic power. I think inevitably that that would take place.

In whatever way we undertake it, whatever the form of the treaty, whether a protectorate or by treaty of neutralization, the United States would still have the burden and responsibility, even though war should result. If it were known that we would not go to war to protect it, such a policy would be but a scrap of paper and as worthless as a dead leaf blown by the wind.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator recognize that there are a good many small governments in the world that have maintained their independence for hundreds of years and have never had any war over it at all? Does he not recognize that Switzerland has been a republic for 500 years right in the midst of hostile nations? Siam has been an independent government. There is Holland that has been independent and Sweden and Norway have been independent governments. Italy and Greece have maintained independent governments. It is a

question, however, it seems to me, that you put to the people as to whether they want a protectorate or not, and they are the ones, if we would be willing, who should determine that question. If the Philippine people are willing to take their independence without a protectorate it seems to me we ought not to raise an objection on our part.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I do not care to protract this dialectic process of reasoning indefinitely. I am very glad to yield to the Senator as long as he expresses his opinion. If I can just call attention to it, that is what I desire to do. He is not considering the interests of the United States or the expense or the responsibility so much as he is considering the desire of the Philippine people. I would reverse it myself. I have great regard for the Filipino people; I should like to see them happy and prosperous, but I have a greater regard for the interests of our own people.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Do you not think, Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. And I would not put upon the United States the great burden of protecting the Philippine Archipelago at the discretion of the Philippine people. I would reserve the decision of that question for our own Government and make the decision ourselves. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator believe, if he is acting in the interest of the United States, and I have no doubt he would so act, it would be better for the United States to recognize the independence of those people than attempt to hold them under a protectorate?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think it would be much better, Mr. President, to give them their independence absolutely and unconditionally than it would be to give them their independence and then guarantee to protect them. I think that would be the height of unwisdom.

Mr. SHAFROTH. There is nothing whatever in this bill that speaks of a protectorate.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; but the Senator from Colorado talked about it a great deal; and the Democratic platform, which I suppose has presumptive force, at least declares in favor of it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think that the last Democratic platform was to the effect that a neutralizing agreement should be made with the leading nations of the world.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes. Now, are you going to back up your neutralization agreement when you make it, or allow it to be flouted and defied?

Mr. SHAFROTH. There is no responsibility in that, compared with the responsibility of holding suzerainty over the people.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator, it seems to me, does not believe in the traditional policy of his country to keep out of entangling alliances and treaties with foreign countries and confine ourselves to our own affairs and let Asia and Europe alone. I think myself that we cut off a pretty big slice of the world's affairs when we undertake to be a leader in the Western Hemisphere, without going into Asia and undertaking to say to the countries there what they shall do about the Philippine Islands. The retention of the Philippine Islands is a condition that has existed for 17 years. I have attempted to argue that it is not now open for argument any more than a law case that has been tried and submitted and finally determined. There ought to be an end to the discussion of this question, a settlement of the governmental policy, just as there is an end to litigation in the interest of repose. There ought to be a statute of limitations against continually reopening the relations of the Philippine Islands to the United States.

What I say is that with the burdens that we already have in America we ought not to go beyond these and undertake the responsibilities of the Philippines without the advantages of control over them. Answering the other part of the Senator's question, I will say I think there are advantages in the retention of the Philippines for the United States. I will very briefly undertake to show why there are.

But the Senator proposes to go beyond that and give up those advantages, if any there are, and retain all the dangers, all the responsibilities, by entering into an agreement as to what the future status of the islands shall be, after surrendering any power of control over their action, and allow them to become embroiled with every nation upon their borders with whom their people come in contact, surrender their finances, turn them over to any possible revolutionary orgy of selfish interest that may get control of the islands, and civil strife, which will inevitably break out, not only between the Moros and between the Christian tribes of the islands but between the different Christian tribes themselves; allow them to violate their contracts with the people of foreign countries, to conduct themselves in the most

irresponsible way in which they may be capable of, and then assume the responsibility for the consequences.

That is quite different, Mr. President, from our present status there, maintaining our relations with the islands and keeping a hand upon their affairs to such an extent that security of life and property is preserved and the sanctity of contract is upheld, and the finances are reasonably well managed. Then we can afford to be responsible for their conduct because we can, in a measure, direct the course of their conduct.

But to propose, as is implied by the Senator's question, that we will release this control, the power to protect, and still be answerable to any country that wants to hold us answerable is quite a different proposition. Suppose you pass this bill to-day, Mr. President; suppose you adopt the Clarke amendment, or rather the preamble to the bill pledging this country in an official way by act of Congress that at some unknown indefinite time in the future we will withdraw from the islands, and we should have a war—I am not apprehensive as some of war—suppose that a war about the islands should arise next year or the year thereafter or 10 years from now, does the Senator propose, and whether he proposes or not it is inevitably involved in the preamble of the bill, that unless we dishonor ourselves, if we are to maintain our honor and protect our sovereignty, we shall have to go to war about the Philippine Islands and expend the treasure and the lives of our country, knowing at the time it was all for nothing, that we had pledged ourselves in advance to abandon the islands?

What has the Senator to say about that? It is a contingency which may happen. It may not be probable, but it is just as liable to happen in 10 years or in 5 years as at any other time. That is a contingency which should be considered in promising to give them their independence while yet retaining them.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I do not regard that a promise of independence imposes any obligation upon us whatever after we have established their independence. Until it is established of course we have a responsibility, but we have these hazards right now, and as long as we maintain the present status of the Philippine Islands we will continue to have that hazard. As sure as we have a difficulty with any foreign nation on the face of the globe there is where they are going to attack us. It is generally recognized by military men that they are a source of weakness to us; that there the attack will be; that there it will be impossible for us to defend because we are 7,000 miles from our base of supplies. That being the case, it seems to me if we could get the leading nations of the world to join us in having a neutralization agreement made it will preserve the peace and quiet not only of our own country but of the Philippine people.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I do not understand that the Senator is a military strategist. I respect his opinion, but I claim the same right to form an opinion about the military features of the question as the Senator from Colorado does, and I do not agree with him.

Mr. SHAFROTH. All I know is that every military man whose opinions I have read seems to imply that. President Roosevelt himself said it was a military weakness to us. Prof. Robinson, the lecturer at the War College, not two months ago announced that it would be a tremendous error for the Government of the United States ever to attempt to defend the Philippines. He said nothing but a weak President would ever send our Navy over there; that if the Philippines were attacked the only way to do would be not to defend them, but at the end of the war, as the result of the war, getting them back by reason of whatever treaty might be made.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I know, Mr. President, some military men may have expressed that opinion and many military men have expressed a contrary opinion. It is easy enough for a Senator—and I am not referring to the Senator from Colorado, whose nearest approach to carrying on a military campaign is running a plantation—to settle a question by saying if you put a chessman out in front of the others it will be captured, and, with a wave of the hand, upon that profound analysis of the situation, say that the Philippines are a military weakness.

The Senator quotes former President Roosevelt. I have never seen the statement to which he refers, but whether or not Mr. Roosevelt made such a statement, actions speak louder than words. In one of the crises through which Mr. Roosevelt brought us—a difficult situation with Japan—so far from claiming that we ought not to send our fleet to the Orient, he did that very thing; and he settled the crisis with Japan by so doing. When Mr. McKinley was President of the United States he sent a portion of our fleet to the Orient. When we had war with Spain we did not own the Philippine Islands, but he sent the fleet to

the Philippine Islands, and the greatest naval victory in our modern history was gained in Manila Bay.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield to the Senator from Colorado for a question, but I should like to complete my argument. Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well; then I shall not interrupt the Senator, if it is at all disagreeable to him.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is not at all disagreeable to me; it is very pleasant to be interrupted; but it occupies so much time; that is the only objection. I yield to the Senator, however, for a question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that when we declared war against Spain we did not send our forces against Spain in her home territory, because it would have taken ten times the number of men and ten times the number of battleships to have accomplished the same result? Was it not because the Philippines were a source of weakness to Spain, and that it was a point of attack where we would have great advantage, that we attacked her outlying possessions, that were 13,000 miles from her base of supply? And did not that give us an advantage in that war which we would not have had if we had attacked Spain on her home territory?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the Philippine Islands were not so very much farther from Spain than they were from us, so far as miles were concerned. I will listen to the Senator's statement, and then I should like to go on.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the honorable Senator for a moment. He stated that he had not seen the declaration of Mr. Roosevelt to which I referred and which I would like to read to him, because I regard Mr. Roosevelt not only as an able statesman but also as a strong military man. In the January, 1915, number of Everybody's Magazine, President Roosevelt stated:

If we act so that the natives understand us to have made a definite promise, then we should live up to that promise. The Philippines, from a military standpoint, are a source of weakness to us. The present administration has promised explicitly to let them go and by its action has rendered it difficult to hold them against any serious foreign foe. These being the circumstances, the islands should at an early moment be given their independence, without any guarantee whatever by us and without our retaining any foothold in them.

I regard the statement of Mr. Roosevelt upon the military situation, that the Philippines were a source of weakness to us, as being in accord with the sentiments that I have read of many military men, to the effect that any possession that is far distant from its base of supplies must of necessity be a source of military weakness to the country to which it belongs.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am very glad to know that the Senator from Colorado is following the opinion of Col. Roosevelt, even in that matter. I do not know the main subject of his remarks, and I am always skeptical of extracts from statements detached from their context and without knowledge of the circumstances under which they were spoken. I have a very great respect for Col. Roosevelt's opinion, but if he ever expressed the view which it is now stated he did, it is one of the few with which I disagree out of the many opinions which he has expressed, on a great many subjects, with which I heartily agree.

It is proposed by everybody in discussing this question to retain a part of the Philippine Islands for a naval station. It would be as difficult for the United States to defend a part of the Philippine Islands as it would be to defend them all.

I used to have a different opinion, and, in fact, I accepted it without giving any thought to the question. I remember seeing a very distinguished man, under whom I had the privilege of studying law, John Randolph Tucker, who served 20 years in Congress, a very brilliant man, make diagrams on the blackboard to prove that the Hawaiian possessions were a source of weakness to the United States, on some sort of mathematical calculation of fulcrums and levers—I do not remember the details of it—and I accepted it as Gospel truth; but upon thinking about the question, for the purpose of determining my vote on this bill, I have come to an entirely different conclusion as to the strategies of the Philippine Islands.

If we maintain a coaling station and naval base in the Philippine Islands, we shall be called on to defend it. The people of the United States would never for an instant submit to having it taken away from us by force of arms by a foreign country. Consequently such an attempt would precipitate a conflict there; it would necessitate a defense of that coaling station. I am told that Corregidor, the island in Manila Bay, is practically impregnable.

Now, I want to say, Mr. President, that however many men Japan—and I only mention Japan by way of illustration—or any other nation might land upon the shores of the Philippine Islands, however great an army it might put there, it could not

maintain them there. Such a power could not hold the Philippine Islands unless she had the supremacy of the sea. It is a question which will be determined by the mastery of the sea; and it will be another instance in history of the determining influence of sea power upon the destinies of nations. If Japan—

Mr. LIPPITT rose.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just a second. If Japan should succeed in landing troops in the Philippine Islands—which she could probably do somewhere upon their shores—she could not maintain them except by keeping up a continuous line of communication with Japan; she would have to cross the sea; she could be met there by the fleet of the United States, and there, as well as anywhere upon the ocean, if the issue is ever to be made, it can be determined. If we gain the victory, she must evacuate the islands, because she could not maintain her armies there. If she gained the victory, she is the mistress of the Pacific; she has humbled and humiliated us; she can land her troops not only in the Philippines but in California and Washington, and she can invade the continental territory of this country.

Not only that, Mr. President, but she can deny us the right to sail the high seas of the world if she destroys our fleet; she can dictate to us the terms upon which we shall trade with the Orient. We shall be a humbled and subject power if Japan ever reaches the point where she is able to take and hold the Philippines against the United States, regardless of the question of the Philippines themselves.

I may say, Mr. President, that the same proposition applies on the Atlantic coast; that there, as well as upon the Pacific, we must maintain the mastery of the seas, at least against any naval armament which would be sent against us, or else we shall be cut off from intercourse with Europe and there would ensue a slow process of social, political, economic strangulation and disintegration. We must prevail with our Navy upon the sea, whether we have the Philippines or not, for the protection of our honor, of the right to trade and to travel, for the protection of our people around the world. If we do, the Philippines will fall into our lap as an easy result of that power. Now, I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I simply wanted to say to the Senator from Washington, in confirmation of the position which he has most eloquently and forcefully stated, that within two months one of the most eminent officers of the American Navy during a recent visit of mine to the Naval War College in Newport—this officer was at that time studying strategy—expressed to me almost identically the opinion which the Senator from Washington has expressed, and he did so in as forceful language as the distinguished Senator himself is using.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to that.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to suggest one other thought to the Senator in considering this question of the Philippines in time of war, and that is that the enormous development of the submarine and the flying machine is, of course, something as to the exact extent of which we can not tell. It already has given such promise of further possibilities that it is only reasonable to suppose that it may go a great deal further than it has up to the present time. It is not at all unreasonable, it seems to me, to suppose that the day may come when the possibility of the Philippines as a station for submarines and flying machines may be of very great importance. We are only considering them now as a coaling station for our war vessels, but there are other means of offense and defense now in existence than war vessels. It is not at all unwise, it seems to me, to recognize the possibilities in these other directions.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there have been some very able men who have visited the Philippine Islands for the express purpose of studying all of these questions on the ground, and the very suggestion that has just been made by the Senator from Rhode Island has been pointed out by Prof. Blayney, of Rice Institute, of Houston, Tex. I took some pains to inquire into the standing of Prof. Blayney, and I ascertained from the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] that Rice Institute is very handsomely endowed with something like \$12,000,000 endowment, and that all its faculty are men of the very highest class. Consequently I accept with a great deal of confidence—subject, of course, to correction, as lawyers get in the habit of accepting everything, if any evidence to the contrary is introduced—the statements of Prof. Blayney in calling attention to the anomalous proposition in the preamble of this resolution that at some indefinite, vague, future time we pledge ourselves in advance to abandon those islands, that the vital interests of the United States might depend in the unknown developments of warfare upon their retention, just as the Senator from Rhode Island has said. In passing I want to say—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What is the article to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am going to read from it in a moment. It is an article entitled "Our administration of the Philippine Islands," in the January, 1916, issue of the Review of Reviews. I will read an extract from it in a moment, because it is very pertinent, in my opinion.

Before passing the question of the advantage of the islands to the United States I want to say that we must accept the opinion of observers of credence if we desire to arrive at the truth on this question of fact. The success of the American Government in the Philippine Islands in the establishment of a government there such as it has established, in the administration of the material interests of the islands, in their sanitation, in the eradication of disease and of cattle pests, and in the restoration and maintenance of order has enhanced the reputation of the United States and of the citizens of the United States in every country of the Orient. By reason of that accomplishment American citizenship is worth more in that part of the world.

We have gained the respect and admiration of the Orient and of those European nations that have the responsibility of governing oriental countries by our work in the Philippines—a work upon an entirely different theory and different basis than that upon which the government of the British and French colonies is conducted. We have given them a greater amount of autonomy in government; we have extended to them privileges of self-government and of personal liberty and of right and security to a much greater extent than has any other country, and, at the same time, what we have done has not been incompatible with law and order. It is regarded as a great object lesson, and, aside from the military value, Mr. President, which I believe the possession of the islands is, the distinction and reputation which the United States has gained from the work we have done there is not only of a moral value but is of a material value to this country.

Why, Mr. President, one Senator said the other day that we ought to get out of those islands notwithstanding the wishes or the opinions of a lot of two-by-four ward politicians. If the men who, through war and the horrors of war, through the intricate problems of dealing in the Tropics with an oriental people ever accomplished the work which observers say they have accomplished, are the kind of two-by-four ward politicians that they have in Mississippi, my idea of that sort of timber would undergo a great change. They are men who have earned the gratitude of their country, if impartial observers are to be believed, by the honest and unselfish and efficient administration of government for 8,000,000 people; and it throws some light upon the amount of information which Senators discussing the question have when they refer as "two-by-four ward politicians" to men who have increased the honor of the country among foreign nations that have observed what they are doing.

I want to read, preliminary to the article of Prof. Blayney, this note by the editor of the Review of Reviews. He says:

In view of much recent and current discussion regarding the present management of public affairs in the Philippine Islands, we are publishing herewith an article by Prof. Thomas Lindsey Blayney, of the William M. Rice Institute, Houston, Tex. Prof. Blayney is a distinguished scholar, a man of great experience, and an admirer and supporter of President Wilson. All the circumstances of his visit to the Philippines, as well as his relationships at home, render it impossible that Prof. Blayney should have been actuated in his inquiries, and in the preparation of this article for the Review, by any other than the highest and most disinterested motives. Prof. Blayney was one of the professors honored by appointment during the past year by the American committee representing the Albert Kahn Foundation of Paris. This foundation sends two American university professors around the world each year, with the special object in view of having them study oriental conditions and ideals. In correspondence with the editor of this magazine, Dr. Blayney made the following remark:

"I have heard so many expressions of dissatisfaction from prominent Americans, both Democrats and Republicans, in various parts of the world, concerning the present policies of the administration at Manila that I determined to go to the Philippines and satisfy myself concerning the situation there.

"I talked with business men, native and foreign, educators, clergymen, Army and Navy officers, editors, American and British, and many Filipinos of undoubted patriotism and intelligence, and I do not hesitate to assure you that the demoralizing tendency of the policies of the present American administration in the islands is deserving of the widest publicity.

"I am an admirer of President Wilson, and do not wish to be considered as making an attack upon his policies. I have no direct or indirect interest in the islands, other than that of any American citizen who has left nothing undone in the brief time allotted to him to form an unprejudiced opinion, and who cherishes a sincere desire for the prosperity, happiness, and future independence of the islands, whether this be within or without the pale of the American Commonwealth."

I now quote from the body of the article:

When historians of the future shall have spoken a dispassionate and final verdict upon the deeds and achievements of the first decade of our occupancy of the Philippine Islands (before some of our less thoughtful politicians and papers at home had begun to make political capital out

of the so-called "independence movement" in the islands), no more inspiring chapter in our national history will be found. Nor will there be found elsewhere a finer list of names of men representing the best type of American manhood and idealism than the pages that record the first 12 years of American administration and achievement in the Orient.

The present projection of partisan politics into the administration of the Philippine Islands—the tendency to allow party theories and sentimental notions to supersede the dictates of sound judgment and common sense—must needs be looked upon as an incidental, though regrettable, moment in the development of our over-the-sea policies. Above motives of such a type, our real statesmen of both parties, as contradistinguished from political opportunists, will surely rise. There is no phenomenon of our national life more passing strange than that which inclines many of our good people to accept the statements of paid emissaries of the Filipino political junta, or of some of our new and inexperienced officials at Manila, rather than those of our fellow countrymen of long administrative experience in the islands. Especially is this remarkable in view of the fact that the statements of men of this last-named class could easily be either verified or disproven by appealing not only to the records but also to residents of character. To accuse all former officers of administration of insincerity or narrow bias, and to disqualify the evidence of the best men of our own blood in the islands—whether clergymen, educators, jurists, or students of colonial policies—as being prompted by selfish motives, must of necessity be but a passing phase of party blindness and can not continue as a fundamental defect in our national character.

Mr. President, in order to avoid occupying the time of the Senate, I ask leave to print as part of my remarks such portions of the article as I see fit, or the whole of it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The article referred to is as follows:

OUR ADMINISTRATION OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

[By Thomas Lindsey Blayney.]

In view of much recent and current discussion regarding the present management of public affairs in the Philippine Islands, we are publishing herewith an article by Prof. Thomas Lindsey Blayney, of the William M. Rice Institute, Houston, Tex. Prof. Blayney is a distinguished scholar, a man of great experience, and an admirer and supporter of President Wilson. All the circumstances of his visit to the Philippines, as well as his relationships at home, render it impossible that Prof. Blayney should have been actuated in his inquiries, and in the preparation of this article for the Review, by any other than the highest and most disinterested motives. Prof. Blayney was one of the professors honored by appointment during the past year by the American committee representing the Albert Kahn Foundation of Paris. This foundation sends two American university professors around the world each year, with the special object in view of having them study oriental conditions and ideals. In correspondence with the editor of this magazine, Dr. Blayney made the following remarks:

"I had heard so many expressions of dissatisfaction from prominent Americans, both Democrats and Republicans, in various parts of the world, concerning the present policies of the administration at Manila that I determined to go to the Philippines and satisfy myself concerning the situation there.

"I talked with business men, native and foreign, educators, clergymen, Army and Navy officers, editors, American and British, and many Filipinos of undoubted patriotism and intelligence, and I do not hesitate to assure you that the demoralizing tendency of the policies of the present American administration in the islands is deserving of the widest publicity.

"I am an admirer of President Wilson, and do not wish to be considered as making an attack upon his policies. I have no direct or indirect interest in the islands other than that of any American citizen who has left nothing undone in the brief time allotted to him to form an unprejudiced opinion, and who cherishes a sincere desire for the prosperity, happiness, and future independence of the islands, whether this be within or without the pale of the American Commonwealth."

On arriving at Manila Dr. Blayney was told that it would be impossible to induce representative natives to give their real views upon the situation on account of their fear of the political ring. He was therefore greatly gratified at the marks of confidence shown him by intelligent and independent Filipinos. This may be attributed to experience acquired by extended residence in Latin countries of Europe and to his knowledge of oriental character gathered through an extensive acquaintanceship with orientals in Morocco, India, China, and Japan. Prof. Blayney suggested a well-known personage as qualified to give to the people of the United States an unbiased account of the situation. We have preferred, however, to invite Dr. Blayney to give our readers the results of his sincere effort to get at the real facts of a situation which he describes as "bidding fair to become a national disgrace if we allow politics and sentiment to take the place of reason and justice."—The editor.]

Ruskin has said, "The art of any country is the exponent of its social and political virtues." After one has visited our own and other great colonial dependencies in the Orient, he is tempted to paraphrase Ruskin's statement and to assert that "the colonial undertakings of a country are the surest reflection of its social and political ideals." Nowhere can the best impulses born of national virtues be appreciated more clearly than when seen in perspective as translated into the administrative policies of a great nation in its control of an alien people.

A great nation—a nation whose body politic is sound and whose greatness is measured not merely by its economic prosperity, but by all those dynamic potentialities reflected in varied forms of civic and philanthropic idealism—necessarily projects into the economic, social, and political life of a dependency (the situation being normal) the quintessence of the best aspiration of the race.

Tested by the foregoing, our own country may well be proud of the record made by its administrators in Habana, Porto Rico, Panama, and till recently in the Philippines. Both we ourselves and foreign critics have found weaknesses in our national life. Nevertheless our recent history has amply proven that in the last analysis we are both efficient and idealistic. This has been shown by the varied manifestations of our endeavors as applied to dependent peoples—the reflection of the disinterested idealism and nonpartisan motives of our best lawgivers at home and our experienced administrators abroad.

OUR SPLENDID RECORD.

When historians of the future shall have spoken a dispassionate and final verdict upon the deeds and achievements of the first decade of our

occupancy of the Philippine Islands—before some of our less thoughtful politicians and papers at home had begun to make political capital out of the so-called "independence movement" in the islands—no more inspiring chapter in our national history will be found. Nor will there be found elsewhere a finer list of names of men representing the best type of American manhood and idealism than the pages that record the first 12 years of American administration and achievement in the Orient.

The present projection of partisan politics into the administration of the Philippine Islands—the tendency to allow party theories and sentimental notions to supersede the dictates of sound judgment and common sense—must needs be looked upon as an incidental, though regrettable, moment in the development of our over-the-sea policies. Above motives of such a type our real statesmen of both parties, as contradistinguished from political opportunists, will surely rise. There is no phenomenon of our national life more passing strange than that which inclines many of our good people to accept the statements of paid emissaries of the Filipino political jingo, or of some of our new and inexperienced officials at Manila, rather than those of our fellow countrymen of long administrative experience in the islands. Especially is this remarkable in view of the fact that the statements of men of this last-named class could easily be either verified or disproven by appealing not only to the records but also to residents of character. To accuse all former officers of administration of insincerity or narrow bias, and to disqualify the evidence of the best men of our own blood in the islands—whether clergymen, educators, jurists, or students of colonial policies—as being prompted by selfish motives, must of necessity be but a passing phase of party blindness and can not continue as a fundamental defect in our national character.

Undoubtedly the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress and of the American public, irrespective of party, wants to do the right thing by the Filipinos. Nevertheless there is an unfortunate impression abroad that much that has been written regarding the present administration is prompted by selfish interests. The following observations made in the course of a visit at Manila are therefore submitted as disinterested evidence. These observations deal largely with questions upon which opinions differ at Washington and concerning which it is very difficult in the United States to secure first-hand information. They reflect the consensus of opinion of most representative Americans, as well as of Filipinos and foreigners in the islands, and, for brevity's sake, the opinions and arguments of the writer are allowed to obtrude as little as possible.

THE CHANGE IN SENTIMENT TOWARD AMERICANS.

No greater surprise is in store for the traveler upon his arrival at Manila to-day than the realization that American ideals are now at a discount in the islands. With but one exception practically all Americans, Filipinos, and Englishmen speak of a marked lessening of respect for Americans and things American. (The exception is an American lawyer having business relations with Filipino politicians, and who, the writer understands, has represented Filipino interests at Washington.) This was explained by the fact that the politicians and public have seen courageous administrators, men whom they at heart admired, but under whose efficient administration the "politicos" had chafed and who therefore had been mercilessly attacked by them, replaced under the new administration by inexperienced officials. And when they saw these new arrivals begin to curry favor with the politicians and to call themselves "friends of the Filipinos," they became bewildered. And this bewilderment gave way to a lessening of respect for Americans in general when it was seen that these inexperienced men of the "new régime," by the frequent use of this word "friend," attributed by implication the contrary to the long list of the best administrative officers the American Government in the past had been able to send to them, and whom it seemed now the fashion to consider as little better than "carpet baggers." And when they found some of the most important of these new "friends" at times deficient in statesmanlike judgment and poise and not too careful in their utterances of the dignity of their positions, there could not but result an inevitable slump in their esteem for Americans in general. It is felt that this situation should be remedied at once; that so long as the American flag continues to fly, our administrative officers should not fall below a fixed high standard of attainment, experience, dignity, courage, and vision; and that ample powers should be vested in them for the sake both of administrative efficiency and of the dignity of their offices. The writer concurs in believing that the early actions and pronouncements of some of our high officials of the new administration can not be lived down. He regrets also to have to add that the personality and qualifications of two of the important American officials of the new administration are of such an order that he has never seen their names mentioned without a general smile of commiseration being called forth.

CURRYING FAVOR WITH FILIPINO POLITICIANS.

All Americans and foreigners of experience agree in feeling that it is not only a serious mistake studiously to curry favor with disaffected politicians, but that it is a grave error of administrative judgment to hesitate, either at Manila or Washington, in adopting effective measures and policies for fear of wounding the susceptibilities of the Filipinos. The contention seems established that the "mestizo" politician is devoid of any feeling of gratitude toward the United States. That, therefore, discarding any hope of appreciation in return, it should be our single purpose to give to the islands the kind of administration which may command, not the plaudits of the present but rather the approbation of history and the gratitude of future generations. It is felt at Manila that anything short of this does not represent the highest and best form of American idealism; that this is what the great majority of American people want to see practiced abroad, however far at times we may fall short of it at home.

On the other hand, many of the "wild tribes" are considered as having a genuine appreciation for whatever they realize as being done to help them. It is the consensus of opinion of informed persons that the government of these tribes must remain in the hands of the United States and its representatives. The Filipino has never shown, nor is he likely to show, any real concern for their welfare. And yet they are considered to have a future full of promise under the capable and sympathetic hand of men like Mr. Dean C. Worcester. It is felt on all sides that the loss of this experienced administrator has in nowise been replaced, and that the President could do a real service to humanity by seeing to it that men of this type be not eliminated from the service.

A HIGH STANDARD OF CIVIL SERVICE ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY.

And this brings us to the very heart of the question. It is the opinion of all Americans and foreigners that the inviolability of the civil service must be reestablished by Gov. Gen. Harrison or by his successor if the good name of our governmental methods is not to be irrevocably

compromised. Also that the mere fact of a Filipino being an aspirant for office should not be a sufficient reason for his appointment, as has been too frequently the case under the present administration. The claim is made by the administration that such charges are not in keeping with the facts, and that only Filipinos of unquestionable qualifications have been allowed to supersede American officials. The following incident, the facts of which were received first hand by the writer, will, however, illustrate the "careful" way in which under the new era Filipinos have been appointed to offices of trust:

The post of assistant director of the Bureau of Agriculture was to be filled. Without even consulting the American director of the bureau, the Governor General promised the post, at the request of the speaker of the assembly, to a henchman of the latter, the then governor of the Province of Pampanga. Shortly before the appointment was to be made public Gov. Gen. Harrison at a dinner party casually informed the director that he had "found an assistant director" for him. Now, it so happened that the Filipino governor selected for the post by the "ring" and accepted by the Governor General had been one of the most recalcitrant of the native governors toward carrying out the hygienic orders issued by the bureau for the prevention of the spread of rinderpest, and a man who had caused the bureau in the past endless trouble. And yet here he was being placed by the administration in a position to enforce in an executive capacity the very regulations which he had insistently ignored. The director endeavored to impress the Governor General with the utter impossibility of the situation, but it was not until after a number of conversations and until the director had threatened his immediate resignation, if a man with such a record were foisted upon him, that the Governor General made what explanations he could to the speaker of the assembly and found another berth for this "excellently recommended" official. It can readily be imagined that such an uncomplacent director of agriculture was not able to continue to serve the "new régime" very long and is now numbered among those who have "resigned."

This incident is cited not to insinuate that the Governor General promised the friends of this Filipino to appoint him, knowing him to be incompetent, but merely to illustrate the "spirit" that now reigns and the happy-go-lucky and reckless manner in which appointments are promised where "politics" and not "efficiency" is the watchword. Such political theories are bad enough in some of our cities at home, but infinitely worse in our distant possessions, where they bring disgrace upon our flag under the very eyes of the efficient colonial administrations of the Dutch and British.

It is believed, furthermore, that to make a financial showing at the expense of efficiency, or to attain this end by stopping expenditures that have heretofore gone for greatly needed public improvements, is neither "making a record" in keeping with American notions of progress nor in accord with what are felt to be the views of the President of the United States as regards governmental efficiency. The loss of men like Gov. Forbes, Mr. Worcester, Dr. Heiser, Capt. Sleeper, Mr. Taylor, and many others who have recently "resigned," is not only a reproach to present-day methods at Manila—a matter of grave local importance—but is looked upon as a distinct setback in the development of better and more stable institutions in the entire Orient in the interest of humanity as a whole.

MORALE OF BUREAU OF SCIENCE VIRTUALLY DESTROYED.

No institution has prospered more under civil service than the Bureau of Science at Manila. This admirable institution had been developed to a point where it had commanded the high respect of scientists in all parts of the world, and especially in the Orient. The ill-advised utterances of the new secretary of the interior upon his arrival, regarding the abolishment of certain departments of research (with the workings of which it was said he had not been familiar and which seemed to him to be "too theoretical"), has created, as might easily have been foreseen, a most unfortunate impression upon the minds of the people. It necessarily has not only lowered the prestige of the bureau and discouraged men from remaining in it or attaching themselves to it but it has reflected upon the sound judgment of American scientists. It is felt that such a thoroughly representative American institution and its corps of experienced scientists should be placed beyond the reach of the vagaries of any individual.

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PHILIPPINES AT WASHINGTON.

One of the greatest hindrances to a clearer appreciation of the merits of the arguments favoring a more or less immediate independence for the Filipinos consists, strange as it may seem, in the personality of Señor MANUEL QUEZON, Resident Commissioner from the Philippines at Washington. It is felt at Manila to be very unfortunate that Señor QUEZON should have succeeded in establishing himself in the opinion of Washington as a typical representative of his race. After meeting practically all the leading native political leaders, the writer does not hesitate to assert, that in knowledge of America and of American ways, in ability to adopt our mannerisms, to play upon our feelings and prejudices, and to make himself interesting and attractive in society, there is no public man of his race who can begin to measure up to him. It is vital that this be kept in mind when our lawgivers are discussing the question of independence. For it must be remembered that, as high as he stands above his political colleagues in all those attainments calculated to influence the susceptibilities of Americans, an immensely greater and for the present practically impassable gulf separates these colleagues from the great mass of the ignorant populace even in Luzon. A great proportion of the Filipino people have no clearer notion of "independence" than that it is some sort of a tangible or intangible thing that will bring them an era of plenty with little work and no taxes.

FILIPINO POLITICAL MEETINGS NOT ALWAYS REPRESENTATIVE.

Another point to be kept in mind is that meetings organized to further the measures of political leaders do not necessarily represent the feelings of intelligent, independent Filipinos. Native civilians of this latter class informed the writer that the rivalries already existing, and the taste for spoils already whetted by an ever and too rapidly increasing share in the offices of state presage certain revolution as soon as a firm hand is withdrawn; that it will require several generations of peace and prosperity to train an oriental people into a genuine respect for stable institutions.

In this connection it should be noted, further, that one of the serious mistakes made by visitors at Manila is to form an opinion of the intelligence of an audience or delegation in the islands by its general appearance. Gatherings of this kind are exceedingly impressive, especially if large and if the visitor is a recent arrival, owing to the fondness of the men for well-tailored white suits, which give them an outward appearance of prosperity and intelligence out of

keeping with their attainments and with the environment out of which they come.

INDEPENDENCE NOT DESIRED.

Certainly one of the most surprising things to the visitor, if he is fortunate enough to have heart-to-heart talks with representative Filipinos who are not themselves political aspirants, will be to learn that independence is not desired at this time by men of this type. Every one of them gave it as his opinion that revolution would certainly follow the lowering of the flag. Not one of them would name a time now to be foreseen when he thought independence could be safely promised or granted. Each stated, however, that, should his sentiments become known, he would be a marked man and, whether directly or indirectly, would feel the heavy hand of the "politicos."

The writer has been informed from a most unimpeachable source that even one of the two leading Filipino politicians had recently become rather skeptical about early independence, in view of recent events in the Orient. He feared now he had builded better than he thought and that independence might actually be granted, owing to the support of certain Congressmen not entirely in sympathy with the movement, but who, like many of their constituents, were beginning to feel that the present situation is no credit to the United States. He recognized the dangerously increasing impatience of others in Congress and in the public at seeing ourselves invited "to get out" of the islands, and yet in the same breath being requested to permit the Filipino politicians to bury, as it were, the Stars and Stripes at the foot of the flagpole, to be resurrected and run up whenever they got into international complications. His position, however, rendered it very difficult for him to backwater.

CHARACTER AND WORK OF THE PHILIPPINE ASSEMBLY.

Another matter of disillusionment for those of us who have been guided by feelings of sentiment toward the independence movement is to learn, on studying the situation on the ground, that much that we have heard about the excellent work and disinterested patriotism of the Philippine Assembly is not borne out by the facts. Space will not permit even the mention of the many accounts of the inefficiency of the lawgivers. It might be noted, however, that the last assembly—and, by the way, the very one which, as the writer was informed, Gov. Gen. Harrison went to the length of complimenting in a telegram to Washington—occupied, despite the more or less direct protests of the governor, a great part of its time with questions relating to political posts and appointments, and it was with the greatest difficulty induced to discuss the budget. The statements we sometimes hear regarding "the remarkable work of the assembly demonstrating the capacity of the people for self-government," if sincerely made, are considered at Manila as based upon information furnished by parties interested in the successful workings of the theories of the "new era."

FACTS VERSUS THEORIES.

The facts tend to disprove the statements of those who would rapidly "Filipinize" the service. No clearer proof is needed of the grave risks being run for the sake of a theory than the unfortunate results following the "resignation" of Capt. Sleeper as chief of the land office. This efficient officer had built up a remarkable department, and one that had required years of labor to bring to a standard that was considered a model of efficiency. Deaf to the warnings of men of experience, the new administration appointed a Filipino to succeed him. This man was most carefully selected, since it was recognized on all sides as a test of native ability. In a short time the work of years had become but a shadow of its former self, and, however reluctantly, the administration had to remove the new incumbent. Another Filipino was ultimately appointed, but the department was in very bad shape when the writer left the islands.

REGRETTABLE REFLECTIONS ON AMERICAN ADMINISTRATORS.

There is another factor which bodes for many years to come little success to a Filipino administration of the islands. The ingenious lies, innuendoes, and slanderous attacks, under the very shadow of the flag, upon the character and administration of our most highly respected officials in the past, because their rulings ran counter to special interests or prejudices of certain factions, is not considered as auguring well for the conditions that would exist when the flag comes down, granted even that native officials would pretend to attempt to uphold hygienic or other efficient measures against the wishes of the masses. The rapid increase of the rinderpest under the régime of Gov. Gen. Harrison after the control of the situation had been taken from the bureau of agriculture and placed under provincial supervision and certain "economies" of administration has been inaugurated should sober the most enthusiastic advocates of immediate wider autonomy.

CRITICISMS ON PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS.

Filipino politicians, backed by their party papers, have long made the expenditures for the construction of the Benguet Road and its terminus—the splendid health resort of Baguio—a favorite subject of attack in reflecting on the administration of former American commissioners. It is true there was an error of judgment on the part of the engineering expert who reported on the probable cost, but for this the commissioners should not be held responsible. Rather than being a reproach to the executive ability of former administrations, both the road and the resort are now seen to be assets of the highest value, although the road will soon lose its importance, owing to the construction of a safer highway in another part of the mountains. Personally the writer feels, after visiting India and the famous British "Hill Station," Darjeeling in the Himalayas, that Baguio is one of the most creditable and enduring monuments to the foresight and forethought of former commissioners. Mr. Harrison and Mr. Denison, possibly for the sake of consistency, spent the past summer in Japan and China, and therefore the government was not transferred to Baguio for the hot months. And yet when the writer visited Baguio it was full of Filipinos from Manila, who now own residences in what only a few years ago was but an uninhabited mountain top. This is conclusive proof that, although always ready to seek out every possible excuse to compromise the administration of American commissioners in the eyes of Congress, they are not slow to profit by the results of the very administrative policies they have so severely criticized.

APPOINTING A PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY.

Since leaving the islands the writer has learned through a copy of the Manila Times that prophecies he had heard made there, and which it was hoped would not be realized, had proven correct, and that the presidency of the University of Manila had been given to a Filipino gentleman "for whom no other post was available, but whose

friends insisted that he must be taken care of." This program of Filipinization was too much even for Secretary Denison, who, as a member of the board of control, at first opposed the Filipino, desiring an efficient American educator at the head of this important institution during the first and most important years of its development. His protest, however, was unavailing. This stand represents a radical change in his views as expressed soon after his arrival in the islands in a much-criticized speech, the general tenor of which might be summed up in the since oft-quoted assertion it contained: "Why should we insist upon 'hustling' the East against its will and at its expense if the East itself wishes to lie placid, murmuring mañana?" It is felt that his other no less famous public statement in regard to a letter delayed three weeks in delivery is typical of the sophomoric theories of government entertained by the new administration: "If the Filipino people prefer to have their letters arrive in three weeks and do it themselves, why haven't they the right to do it that way?"

THE PRESIDENT NOT BLAMED.

The majority of Americans and foreigners at Manila do not feel that the President is correctly informed concerning existing conditions, and are therefore unwilling to hold him directly responsible for the present situation. They rather attribute it to the shortsightedness and excess of zeal shown by the administration at Manila in making a "record" such as they might wish to make at home after a political upheaval. Some of these officials seem forgetful of the ignorance of the great mass of Filipinos regarding our traditional treatment of "officeholders" in this country upon a change of administration, and inexcusably forgetful of the supreme importance of maintaining in our over-the-sea dependencies the well-earned reputation of American officials, past or present, and irrespective of party, for disinterested public service. Some of them have compromised the good name and dignity of American institutions abroad by actions and utterance which either reflect upon the sincerity of the intentions of past administrations or else are not in keeping with the views which the American public at Manila believed to be those of the President relative to administrative decorum abroad. To mention but one example:

Only those who have been in Manila and are familiar with the various undercurrents of sentiment and with the personal histories of individuals there can form a conception of the astonishment felt by the audience when, as a number of witnesses told the writer, the distinguished guest of the occasion, a man who incorporates the dignity of American institutions by his exalted position, placed his arm about the shoulders of a Filipino politician and declared that it was "to this man" that he owed his position, and that he would not forget the kindness as long as he lived. The remark was considered, for reasons that can not be touched upon here, not only as lacking excessively in good taste, but also as showing exceedingly poor judgment, in that it magnified the Filipino in the esteem of his countrymen at the expense of the President of the United States, from whom the appointment had come.

HOW THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION IS REGARDED.

SEÑOR QUEZON made the public statement at the Lake Mohonk conference in 1914 that "Gov. Harrison has gained for himself and for the Nation that he represents the confidence and good will of the Filipino people." This statement, according to reliable American evidence and that of intelligent Filipinos, is not in keeping with the facts. Never since the early years of occupation has genuine respect and esteem for America and things American been at so low an ebb, for the reasons mentioned above. Gov. Gen. Harrison and his administration enjoy, quite naturally, a certain kind of popularity with the politicians and factions whose aims he seems to support. But that he has raised his country or his countrymen in the respect of the inhabitants is an altogether different matter. Deep regret was voiced on all sides that at the very outset he had launched himself upon a campaign of "reform" from which, in spite of experience gained, it is very hard for him to turn back.

THE FEELING IN THE ISLANDS ON THE JONES BILL.

The feeling of Americans and foreigners in the islands concerning the Jones bill is somewhat as follows: It is considered impossible to foresee what the next 25 or 50 years may bring in the international situation in the Pacific, nor how essential to us and to the best interests of the Filipinos the new inventions constantly being made in aerial and maritime armament and our commercial interests in the East may render the retention of the islands in whole or in part. Therefore it is believed that, if an unnecessary preamble to such a bill must be formulated, sound statesmanship dictates that it should go no further than declaring it to be "the intention of the United States to grant independence to the Philippine Islands as soon as in the judgment of Congress it is deemed to be the best interests of the islands and of the United States to do so." It is further believed that the political element would make at first a bold front of disapproval, but that the great mass of intelligent and peaceful civilians would greet such a statement with sincere satisfaction. A statement of this kind would do more, it is thought, to clear the unhealthy atmosphere of uncertainty and apprehension existing at Manila and to preclude unprofitable discussion than anything that has occurred since the change of administration.

FOREIGN OPINION ON OUR PRESENT PHILIPPINE POLICY.

It is a striking fact that among the many Americans and Britons whom the writer met in India, China, and Japan, and who were more or less familiar with the situation from personal observation, there was not one who did not feel that the almost nervous eagerness of the administration at Manila to conciliate the politicians, even at the cost of some dignity, and the excessive zeal shown in changing the "Filipinizing" the service, had proven a grave error of judgment of more than local importance. That it was destined to render the work of the white man in the uplift of dependent races very difficult in more distant parts of the Orient. It was pointed out by the British that, if, as we claimed, our interest in the islands was purely humanitarian, we should not transfer our political differences of opinion and more or less questionable party theories into the administration of our island dependencies, but rather seek to govern them along recognized lines of administrative efficiency for their own highest welfare, and in the interest of humanity as a whole. That to transfer our own advanced theories of democratic government to an inexperienced people just emerging from a period of almost medieval darkness, many of whom have not the remotest conception of the real meanings of the words "democracy" and "independence," would be little short of criminal.

OUR LEGACY TO THE PHILIPPINES.

The following statement was made to the writer by an intelligent and highly respected Filipino and is submitted as a final résumé of a

situation which can not possibly continue with credit to our Government:

"When the American flag is lowered, whether it be in 1 year or in 10 years or in a hundred years, I feel that the United States will be remembered in our island by three principal contributions to our national life: First, by a splendid system of public instruction; secondly, by an excellent judicial system; and, thirdly, by an all-pervading system of petty Tammany politics, the fostering of which the present administration has very largely contributed. And I feel that the last of these contributions will far outshadow in effect the results of the other two to the everlasting misfortune of my race."

No words of the writer could possibly add to the simple force of a statement of this character.

Such, in briefest possible form, are the opinions of the overwhelming majority of men of every shade of opinion and nationality in Manila, both native and foreign, whose opinion, the writer feels, the public would care to learn, and by whose judgment it would wish in a measure to be guided in the solemn hour so fast approaching when a courageous, creditable, and unequivocal decision should be reached—a decision free of political bias and sentimental theories, but destined to involve irrevocably the good name of our country, the statesmanship of our lawgivers, and the future welfare of a dependent people.

AMERICAN IDEALS SHOULD PREVAIL IN THE PHILIPPINES.

We are told that the islands are a menace to us; that by their retention we run the risk of grave complications. And yet, these are the very warnings that were directed against our fathers whenever they contemplated moving our frontiers farther toward the Pacific. Thus far in our history we have never recoiled from following our star of destiny because of real or fancied dangers. And it is not believed that we are going to hesitate now, when millions whom we have led toward a brighter day stand sorely in need of our strong helping hand to conduct them over the last and most difficult part of the way.

If we have not the courage of our forefathers, if the splendid work of American achievement, the self-sacrificing labors of countless men of our own race—the scientist, the educator, the administrator, and the soldier—are to be sacrificed to the empty shibboleth "independence," is it not due our good name to leave the islands now? It is the firm belief of the writer that we owe it to ourselves, to the Filipinos, and to humanity to insist, so long as the American flag continues to fly over Manila and over the hundreds of schools, city halls, and courthouses of the archipelago, promising liberty and justice under its stars and stripes, not to a few political aspirants, but to all that just so long American, and not Filipino, ideals of efficiency, administration, and justice should reign at Manila. And this can not be realized unless we cease the present methods of tearing down the laboriously constructed work of years achieved by American administrative officers, not because we feel it to be in the interest of the people, but at the behest of the native office seeker, whose plea, "independence," seems so irresistible to our democratic ears. The individual man is "free" to-day wherever the Stars and Stripes float to the breeze in the islands. That he will not be "free" when the flag comes down is the firm conviction of all men of broad judgment and experience in the Philippines.

Every principle of humanitarianism and of enlightened statesmanship dictates that we should jealously guard this heritage of future generations and hand it down to them in the form of an efficient, model administration unto the day when they, as an enlightened people, and not as a handful of political dictators, tell the people of the United States what they desire. The American people will then gladly give them what they want.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to take only one moment, I should like to add to the extract he has put in the Record just a few words which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. LIPPITT. The quotation is from a statement by Mr. William F. Montavon, who has just been appointed a commercial attaché of the United States and who for many years has been a superintendent of public schools in the Philippine Islands, and who has a very high opinion of the Philippine people. The Senator from Washington a moment ago was talking about the prestige which our administration of the islands has given us in the Orient. Mr. Montavon, after speaking in the very highest terms of the Philippine people, says:

Our prestige as a Nation is bound up intimately with this Philippine business. The world will be richer materially and morally because of the integrity and intelligence manifested by able men in solving the big questions relating to the islands and their inhabitants.

The quotation was so pertinent to what the Senator was saying that I took the liberty of asking to have it put in the Record.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The article by Prof. Blayney is an extremely illuminating one, as will be realized by those who will take the pains to read it.

Our people have over \$70,000,000 invested in the Philippine Islands. In 1911 they had \$70,000,000 invested there, and I am informed, as I said in the debate here the other day, by Gen. McIntyre that it is known that a large amount of capital has been invested there since that time. There are between eight and ten thousand Americans resident in the Philippine Islands. Many of them have established important businesses there. All of this money was invested there, and all of these people went there, of course, relying upon the benefit of American control of the islands. I do not contend that that is a governing factor in the case; I realize the fact that it is a matter of secondary importance to the larger questions that are involved, including in those larger questions our duties toward the Filipino people themselves; but we can not escape the conclusion, Mr. President, that, other things being equal, the obligation to protect, in a proper way, the property and business of our people who have invested and who reside in

those islands rests upon this country. I object to their abandonment. There is no proposition advanced in connection with the preamble of this bill that any steps whatever will be taken to give security to the Americans, with their great investments and their great interests in these islands. On the other hand, it is proposed to ignore them, proposed to abandon them; to abandon them just as we have abandoned our citizens in Mexico.

I do not want to irritate that issue, but my opinion is that when the European war is closed, when one or the other of the great powers of Europe will be victorious in that struggle, armed as it never was before, we will be confronted with a real international problem if in the meantime, we have not quit this policy of neglect which we have adopted in Mexico.

Now, it is proposed in this bill to adopt the same policy in the Philippine Islands. It is a part of our general foreign policy of surrender and indifference. We have argued many of these questions in detail, and it is not necessary to go into the details again. Our citizens must not travel abroad, for fear they will involve us in trouble with Europe; they must not remain in Mexico, for fear we will be involved in trouble there; we must abandon our right to special rates for the passage of our vessels through the Panama Canal, because of intimate secret issues about which we know nothing; we must pay \$25,000,000 to the Republic of Colombia for their good will. I mention these things because they all together show a general course of conduct, a general attitude in our foreign policy which is bringing shame upon us in many quarters of the world; and a proposal to abandon the fruits of the work of 17 years in the Philippine Islands is a consistent part of that general policy of abandonment and of retreat in every direction in which our people have established their interests abroad. The idea seems to be that we must confine ourselves to our continental borders and must not venture beyond them; that we must give up the interests that we have abroad, and that our people, if they go abroad in pursuit of trade or travel, can not depend upon the Government of the United States to protect them. If this bill should pass, and if all that the flag guarantees in the Philippine Islands is to be withdrawn, there ought to be some provision by which a guaranty of security and of life can be given to Americans who are established there.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think it is in order to ask that the Philippine bill be temporarily laid aside. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

SAN ANTONIO BICENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent for the passage by the Senate of joint resolution 72. I would not ask this but for the fact that immediate action is necessary. The resolution authorizes the President to invite the countries of Spanish America to an exposition to be held at the city of San Antonio in 1918. It does not carry an appropriation. The citizens of San Antonio will hold a meeting next week to prepare the invitations. For that reason I should like to have the resolution go through at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas will have to guarantee to the Senate that there will be no appropriation hereafter made or asked for for that purpose or I certainly shall object to its consideration at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will say to the Senator that the participation we expect the Government to have in the matter will be through exhibits by the various departments, and not through an appropriation by the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know about how much the Government will be involved in that respect?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; I can not give any assurance along that line, but I say to the Senator that the extent of the Government's participation will be such exhibits as are usually made by the departments at expositions.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask that the joint resolution be not considered at this time. I must object to its present consideration, but I will talk to the Senator from Texas about it and see just exactly what it proposes. I have not read it at all, but I say to the Senator that if it is the beginning of another exposition and the entering upon of an appropriation by the Government for that purpose at this time I certainly do not think it ought to be done. As I say, however, I have not read the joint resolution, and I will see the Senator about it between now and to-morrow.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is entirely satisfactory to me. I shall be glad to talk to the Senator about it.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. SIMMONS. From the Committee on Finance I report back favorably Senate resolution No. 10, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It is simply for the pur-

pose of obtaining information with respect to imports and exports for the use of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator if it is the resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on December 7 last?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the Senate information regarding the value of imports, exports, and import duties under the present and the two preceding tariff acts, with a special statement for the period from the enactment of the existing tariff act to the outbreak of the European war, compared with a corresponding period of the previous year; the value of imports, compared with the value of domestic production, and the expenditure for wages in each industry before the outbreak of the European war, and the imports and exports of leading manufacturing countries during recent years.

ADDRESS BY OSCAR T. CROSBY (S. DOC. NO. 245).

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask to have printed as a public document an argument by Oscar T. Crosby, of Washington, D. C., relative to Senate bill 2710, to encourage the establishment of an international peace-keeping tribunal, and pending such establishment to assure the military preparedness of the United States. It is a very short matter, and I do not ask that it be printed in the Record, but simply that it be ordered published as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 18, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17, 1916.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

First Lieut. John L. Holcombe, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from January 14, 1916, vice Capt. Edward P. Nones, who died January 13, 1916.

Second Lieut. Calvin M. Smith, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from December 14, 1915, vice First Lieut. Fredrick E. Kingman, who died December 13, 1915.

Second Lieut. John T. H. O'Rear, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from January 14, 1916, vice First Lieut. John L. Holcombe, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Civil Engineer Frederic R. Harris, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, in the Department of the Navy, with rank of rear admiral, for a term of four years.

Ensign Hugh McC. Branham to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1915.

Ensign Roy C. Smith, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1915.

Passed Asst. Paymaster Benjamin H. Brooke to be a paymaster in the Navy from the 22d day of October, 1915.

Professor of Mathematics Paul J. Dashiell, with rank of lieutenant commander, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, with rank of commander, from the 12th day of January, 1916.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Clyde A. Rosseter, of Valentine, Nebr., to be register of the land office at Valentine, Nebr., vice Luke M. Bates, term expired.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 17, 1916.

JUDGE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

George E. Downey to be a judge of the Court of Claims.

MEMBER OF THE CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION.

Capt. Richard Park to be a member of the California Débris Commission.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION FOR PORTO RICO.

Paul G. Miller to be Commissioner of Education for Porto Rico.

MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF PORTO RICO.

Manuel Camunas to be a member of the Executive Council of Porto Rico.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Civil Engineer Frederic R. Harris to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks with the rank of rear admiral.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

William W. Perry, West Blocton.

CALIFORNIA.

John E. Nolan, Jamestown.

COLORADO.

Elsie E. Da Lee Elliott, Redcliff.

Jerry F. Halloran, Victor.

Stephen Ilgenfritz, Ordway.

Joseph Ray, Aguilar.

Fanny Hamilton Simpson, La Veta.

CONNECTICUT.

Robert D. Burns, Saybrook.

IDAHO.

Jessie Beasley, Wardner.

Josephine Ervin, Mullen.

ILLINOIS.

Charles E. Carlson, Woodhull.

W. T. Clopper, Polo.

H. B. Conover, Orion.

Jacob F. Davis, Minier.

William F. de Frenne, Prairie du Rocher.

J. H. Farquharson, Western Springs.

Max Geisenhoner, East Dubuque.

A. W. Hilbalt, Dongola.

Pearl A. Hollingsworth, Fisher.

J. F. Knight, Sandoval.

Grover C. Lindley, Hutsonville.

Robert A. McFarland, Livingston.

Thomas J. McMahon, Chebanse.

C. D. Miller, Milledgeville.

Edward J. Mulligan, Bradley.

Joseph H. Mulligan, Kewanee.

Frank L. O'Brien, Maple Park.

B. J. Ritson, Farmington.

Emma R. Ritzman, Orangeville.

Albert Schrieber, Red Bud.

W. W. Sloan, Rockton.

Edward Streng, Stewardson.

W. J. Sullivan, Hanover.

Henry Uphaus, Macon.

Louis Wolter, Marissa.

INDIANA.

Herbert P. Carpenter, Elwood.

Maurice L. Cory, Kingman.

John L. Fraley, Anderson.

Frank D. Haimbaugh, Muncie.

Joseph T. Kistler, Royal Center.

Louis H. Kocher, Churubusco.

Guy Longest, English.

William W. Ludtke, Rolling Prairie.

Otto A. Minear, Claypool.

John T. Scott, Valparaiso.

James P. Simons, Monticello.

IOWA.

K. F. Baldrige, Bloomfield.

Edward M. Bratton, Shellsburg.

E. F. Breen, Farley.

Joseph G. Geister, Primghar.

J. J. McMahon, Toledo.

George Ritz, Rockwell City.

S. I. Rutledge, Iowa Falls.

Ira A. Squier, Sutherland.

Albert F. Steffen, Hull.

Peter Wohlenberg, Everly.

KANSAS.

B. M. Palmer, Jewell.

J. H. Rathbun, Downs.

Charles C. Seewir, Lawrence.

Leonard Willems, Lansing.

KENTUCKY.

Tarleton C. Hobbs, Anchorage.

Hubert Hutton, Berry.

Judith W. Montgomery, Greensburg.

MAINE.

Oscar H. Dilworth, Madison.
James L. Foster, Livermore Falls.
Franklin K. Jack, Bowdoinham.
Theodore C. Haley, Rangeley.
Frederick W. Hartnett, Bath.
Edward Lynch, South Berwick.

MISSISSIPPI.

Sheppard Lamar Martin, Wiggins.
Emma L. Whyte, Bond.

MONTANA.

Lawrence C. Porter, Winifred.
Meta W. Shaw, Terry.
George E. Shawler, Geraldine.

NEBRASKA.

O. C. Lamb, Guide Rock.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Edward S. Perkins, Sunapee.
Samuel Runlett, Durham.
Joseph Warren, Rochester.

NEW JERSEY.

Joseph Edward Charles, Wenonah.
Charles G. Hatcher, Smithville.

NEVADA.

E. M. George, Battle Mountain.
Laura Hoegh, Eureka.
George W. Likes, Fallon.
James J. McQuillan, Tonopah.
Thomas D. Rogers, Manhattan.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Abraham T. Anderson, Turtle Lake.
John E. Dick, McVile.
Gilbert M. Eng, Douglas.
Harriet M. Frank, Powers Lake.
H. M. Haakenson, Hatton.
William F. L. Makee, Noonan.

OHIO.

Joel C. Clore, Cincinnati.

OKLAHOMA.

J. L. Buckley, Texhoma.
Thomas B. Dunlap, Ringling.
Charley M. Foil, Jennings.
J. A. Miller, Beaver.

OREGON.

T. J. Anderson, Harrisburg.
James W. Dunn, St. Benedict.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William L. Marshall, Dayton.

RHODE ISLAND.

Sumner Mowry, Peace Dale.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Dana N. Bonesteel, Artesian.
W. F. McGuigan, McIntosh.
J. W. McMahon, Salem.

TEXAS.

W. F. Lancaster, Bowie.
Osceola G. Wilson, Nixon.

VERMONT.

Frank H. Clark, Windsor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 17, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, because we believe in Thee as the final cause, the source from whom proceedeth all things, and we most fervently pray that we may be susceptible to the Holy Spirit ever emanating from Thee, that Thy kingdom may come in our hearts and Thy will be done in our lives. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 15, 1916, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER. The credentials of Mr. W. W. VENABLE, the newly elected Member from Mississippi, are on the Speaker's

table, signed by the governor and secretary of state in the regular form.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I present Mr. VENABLE and ask that he be sworn in.

Mr. VENABLE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the father-in-law of my son is dead at my house, and I feel that I ought to ask leave of absence for to-day. I wish to say that there are a number of bills on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent reported from the committee of which I am chairman. The authors and the gentlemen who reported those bills are here and are able to take care of them. I request leave of absence for to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks leave of absence for to-day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

ANSHE CHESED CONGREGATION, VICKSBURG, MISS.

The first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4954) directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss.

The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota objects.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I shall object to all of these bills to-day on this Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question? I ask unanimous consent to do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question. It seems to me the gentleman from Minnesota would determine that, but in any event the Chair will put the request. Is there objection to the gentleman from Texas catechizing the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARNER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he was going to object to all of the bills on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent?

Mr. LINDBERGH. All of these that are here; yes.

Mr. GARNER. Then, I suggest that it is not necessary to call these bills for unanimous consent if the gentleman gives notice now that he intends to object to all of them, unless the Chair is going to recognize Members in charge of bills to suspend the rules and pass them.

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair is going to do.

Mr. COLLIER. Then I will make that motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FERRIS. Has not the gentleman to wait until the bills are called through the calendar?

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman from Mississippi moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 4954, with committee amendments.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a perfect right to make that point. Evidently there is not a quorum here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Driscoll	Hulbert	Patten
Bacharach	Drukker	Hutchinson	Porter
Barchfeld	Dupré	Jones	Powers
Beales	Dyer	Keister	Reilly
Bennet	Fairchild	Kent	Riordan
Brown, W. Va.	Farley	Kless, Pa.	Sabath
Bruckner	Flynn	Kitchin	Scott, Pa.
Buchanan, Tex.	Focht	Kreider	Scully
Caldwell	Gallagher	Lafean	Sells
Carew	Gallivan	Lieb	Sherley
Casey	Garland	Liebel	Siegel
Chandler, N. Y.	Graham	Linthicum	Slomp
Chipperfield	Gray, Ala.	Loft	Stedman
Coady	Gray, N. J.	Longworth	Summers
Cullop	Gregg	McLemore	Tague
Dale, N. Y.	Guernsey	Maher	Talbot
Darrow	Hamill	Mays	Ward
Davenport	Haskell	Miller, Pa.	Whaley
Dempsey	Haugen	Mooney	Williams, W. B.
Dies	Hilliard	Morgan, La.	Winslow
Dooling	Holland	Nolan	Wise
Doremus	Howell	Paine, Mass.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 346 Members, a quorum, responded to their names.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4954) as amended, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4954) directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to convey by deed to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss., a small tract of land for cemetery purposes, which land is now part of the Vicksburg National Military Park, and more particularly described by metes and bounds as follows:

Commencing at the southeast corner of a tract of land as described in deed book C C, page 611, in chancery clerk's office, Warren County, Miss.; thence with an astronomical azimuth 100° 40' 992 feet to a stone post; thence 209° 10' 509 feet to a stone post; thence 225° 55' 461 feet to a stone post; thence 220° 50' 398 feet to a stone post on the south side of the Baldwin Ferry Road; thence 296° 10' 198 feet; thence 355° 10' 105 feet; thence 23° 15' 178 feet to the point of beginning.

Thence with an astronomical azimuth no degrees and 15' 534 feet; thence 270° 15' 318½ feet; thence 132° 5' 251 feet; thence 171° 20' 259 feet; thence 134° 25' 143 feet to the point of beginning; containing 1.64 acres, more or less, and being part of section 21, township 16, range 4 east: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States in carrying out the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Mississippi is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois to 20 minutes.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I think I can get through discussing this bill in much less than the 20 minutes of time allotted to me. In fact, the report accompanying the bill states the facts as completely as I could, but to save you the trouble of reading that fine print I will state briefly, for your information, the following:

When the Vicksburg Military Park was established it was found that the Anshe Chesed Congregation Cemetery was stationed near the place where the old fortifications were, and that some of this land was needed to complete the park. In 1900 the congregation gave to the Federal Government 19.5 acres of land—

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What was the name of the cemetery?

Mr. COLLIER. The Anshe Chesed, the Jewish cemetery at the city of Vicksburg. Through their patriotic desire to see that great work perpetuated the congregation gave to the Federal Government 19.5 acres of their cemetery for a nominal consideration. They wanted to give it for nothing, but it was given for a nominal consideration of \$1 and the moving of a fence.

It now seems, gentlemen, that they gave more of their cemetery than they should, because they now need more room, and they come and ask the Federal Government to reconvey to them 1.64 acres. There is no objection to this from any source that I have found. The land that is being asked to be reconveyed has no special significance in that it is commemorated by a tablet, memorial, or marker. The chairman of the park commission, Capt. W. T. Rigby, has recommended that this 1.64 acres be conveyed back to that congregation, but the Judge Advocate General has stated—and you will find it in the report—that the War Department has no authority to reconvey that land, but that we will have to come to Congress to get that authority. Judge Crowder states that the War Department will favor any congressional legislation looking to that end, which opinion is concurred in by the Acting Secretary of War.

Now, another point. It might be suggested as to what effect this will have upon the appearance of that park. It will simply be moving a fence down a short distance, and any effect it will have will be that of still more beautifying the park, because they will add more monuments therein.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, except I wish to bring this out, that the committee has made an amendment that this transfer shall be made at no cost to the United States, which amendment was, of course, accepted by the author of the bill and is entirely satisfactory to the congregation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. From what committee did the bill come?

Mr. COLLIER. This bill comes from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demanded a second in order that the matter might be explained to the House. I have myself no opposition to the bill. If anyone desires a part of my time in opposition to the bill, I will yield to him, otherwise I will yield two minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Washington delegation, Mr. Henry J. Pierce, of Seattle, Wash., will deliver a lecture on "The necessity for water-power development" at the new National Museum, at the foot of Tenth Street NW., on to-morrow evening at 8.30. I have heard this lecture of Mr. Pierce upon this very important proposition. It contains a vast amount of information, and Mr. Pierce is certainly one of the best-posted men on this question in the United States. In addition to his lecture he will show moving pictures of the great nitrogen establishments of Norway and Canada. I call special attention to this as bearing on this question of preparedness. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this invitation of the Washington delegation in the RECORD, so that Members may see it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to insert the invitation mentioned in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The invitation is as follows:

At the request of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington Mr. Henry J. Pierce, of Seattle, Wash., will deliver his lecture entitled "The Necessity for Water-Power Development" in the auditorium of the new National Museum, B Street, foot of Tenth Street NW., on Tuesday, January 18, 1916, at 8.30 p. m., illustrated by moving pictures.

The Members of Congress and their families and others to whom this is addressed are cordially invited to be present.

This procedure is prompted by the critical importance of this subject at this session of Congress. Among the many important matters which are dependent upon water-power development is the establishment of the nitrogen industry. Nitrogen is necessary to our national defense and to our agricultural welfare. We are now dependent upon foreign sources, which may be cut off in time of need. Among the motion pictures shown by Mr. Pierce are those of the great nitrogen establishments of Norway and Canada. It is believed that a general attendance by Members of Congress will prove exceedingly valuable and timely in connection with the legislative consideration that must be given to a Federal water-power policy at this session of Congress.

WESLEY L. JONES.
MILES POINDEXTER.
W. E. HUMPHREY.
ALBERT JOHNSON.
W. L. LA FOLLETTE.
L. H. HADLEY.
C. C. DILL.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

BIRTHDAY OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this bill pertains to national memorials, which enables me to say the few words I desire to say to the House this morning on a kindred subject.

Mr. Speaker, contemporaneous history does not always record that which is great in our citizenship. We are periodically boastful and are sometimes addicted to hero worship, but that which is truly great in our men and women is too often permitted to pass without that recognition which is the sweetest reward of achievement. The definition of a statesman attributed to Thomas B. Reed, a truly great Speaker of the House of Representatives, will serve best to illustrate the thought in mind. "A statesman," he said, "is a successful politician who is dead."

I am prompted to make these observations this morning because, with the indulgence of the House, I shall speak briefly of Benjamin Franklin, one of the truly great Americans who has come to be recognized the world over as the greatest of our philosophers. To-day is the two hundred and tenth anniversary of the birth of Franklin in the city of Boston. The major part of the 84 years of his life were spent in the district in Philadelphia which I have the honor to represent. When he was not laboring in that district as a practical printer or in working out the many problems which placed him a century ahead of the geniuses of public thought and benefaction he was performing for the American colonists those admirable feats of diplomacy in the courts of Great Britain and France which commanded a respect for American characteristics that in later years we have come to refer to proudly as "American institutions."

It would be idle, however, in the few minutes I am permitted to speak to attempt a eulogy, much less a review, of the life and works of Benjamin Franklin. I have in mind only to say that his mortal remains, now long since turned to dust, lie under a marble slab—provision for which was made by his own will—in old Christ Church burial ground at Fifth and Arch Streets, Philadelphia. It would not be fair to the American people of April 17, 1790, when Benjamin Franklin died, to say that they

did not mourn his loss, for they did. He had asked for a plain funeral, and had designated the maker of the stone and the inscription that should go upon it to mark the last resting place of his wife Deborah and himself; but the people of Philadelphia and such distinguished visitors as could appear at the obsequies turned out in goodly numbers and with much formality to honor the man whom they had come to respect and admire. The greatness of Franklin as a world figure, however, had not then fully dawned upon them. It was perhaps more in the Old World, notably in France, that Franklin's fame was heralded, even as one who had brought a new light into the world. In England he was not only famous, but, if the stories of the suppression of the manuscript of his autobiography, even as Jefferson has referred to it, be true, he was also feared. He had delivered his message to the world, and that message, although not fully printed or understood until long years after his death, left no doubt as to its meaning or of the world influence of the new Republic in the Western Hemisphere.

But now, Mr. Speaker, a full century and sixteen years having elapsed since the mortal life of Franklin was extinguished, we find in every avenue of thought and activity the light of his philosophy, his truth, and his inventions illuminating the world. The greatness of the individual has been recognized in consequences and effects more durable and more beneficent than even the author of them could have ever hoped for. And yet whether it be due to the ingratitude of succeeding generations or, as is more likely, to their thoughtlessness in the press of the activities generated in the philosophy and thought of Franklin there has been no National, State, nor local memorial erected over his last resting place. There under the stone for which he personally made provision, hemmed in by the towering walls of business structures in the heart of the great city, he lies. Across the street is the identical house in which the American flag was first woven into its present form by the deft fingers of Betsy Ross. Within rifle shot is the scene of his courtship and the incident of the penny loaves to which history refers. The scene of his kite-flying, through which he drew electricity from the clouds, is equally near. The home of the American Philosophical Society, of which he was the president, stands intact two blocks away. And there, also, is Independence Hall, in which he signed the Declaration of Independence and in which he labored, as no other man, to perfect in the Constitution of the United States those provisions which gave us a bicameral form of government.

The sites of the homes of Washington and Morris, his great contemporaries in the establishment of the Union of States, are easily traced a short distance from his grave, and Christ Church, in which Washington and the signers of the Declaration of Independence worshiped and by whose walls some of them lie buried, is still breathing forth its message of hope and sympathy to a religious community. Indeed, in the immediate environment of Franklin's grave, with its fast deteriorating cover of stone, paid for by his own estate, historic landmarks and memories cluster in profuse array.

If at last, Mr. Speaker, we have come to recognize that which was truly great in the wonderful Franklin is it not time, for the sake of his teachings and the influence of his philosophy upon the present generation and of the generations to come, that we celebrate in some national way the worth and the patriotism of this many-sided American? [Applause.]

In the city of Philadelphia he is not forgotten. There are memorials yonder which do honor to his name. On this the anniversary of his birth, the Poor Richard Club, which is now looking forward to a convention of the advertising clubs of the world who honor Franklin as the patron of "The Art Preservative," will lay a chaplet on his grave. Elsewhere in the great City of Brotherly Love tributes will be paid to his memory, notably at the University of Pennsylvania, which owes to him its origin.

But it is not alone for a city or a State to honor Franklin; it should be the grateful task of a Nation the honor and integrity of which he successfully sustained in the courts of the world. [Applause.]

Putting on a practical basis the suggestion just made for a national recognition of Franklin in some such memorial as will signalize the pride of the Nation in his character, I have introduced a bill to which the attention of Congress and the Nation is respectfully invited.

I see by the clock, Mr. Speaker, that a few minutes yet remain of the time kindly allotted to me by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and in that brief period I wish to read one or two extracts from the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin which was not published until many years after his death. These extracts will show but feebly the many sides of this truly wonderful man, but they will assure us something of the intense humanity that dominated his every action, not only in things

which were political or in the line of statesmanship but in those which pertained to the elevation of mankind generally.

I had, on the whole, abundant reason—

Says Benjamin Franklin—

to be satisfied with my being established in Pennsylvania.

I call attention to this brief specimen of beautiful English, a style that was used by many of the founders of the Republic, and which to a large extent, due to our modern interest and our desire to hit the bull's-eye quicker than our forefathers did, has passed away:

There were, however, two things that I regretted, there being no provision for defense nor for a complete education of youth; no militia, nor any college. I therefore, in 1743, drew up a proposal for establishing an academy; and at that time, thinking the Reverend Mr. Peters, who was out of employ, a fit person to superintend such an institution, I communicated the project to him; but he, having more profitable views in the service of the proprietaries, which succeeded, declined the undertaking; and, not knowing another at that time suitable for such a trust, I let the scheme lie a while dormant. I succeeded better the next year, 1744, in proposing and establishing a Philosophical Society. The paper I wrote for that purpose will be found among my writings when collected.

With respect to defense, Spain having been several years at war against Great Britain, and being at length join'd by France, which brought us into great danger; and the laboured and long-continued endeavour of our governor, Thomas, to prevail with our Quaker Assembly to pass a militia law, and make other provisions for the security of the Province, having proved abortive, I determined to try what might be done by a voluntary association of the people. To promote this, I first wrote and published a pamphlet entitled "Plain Truth," in which I stated our defenseless situation in strong lights, with the necessity of union and discipline for our defense, and promis'd to propose in a few days an association, to be generally signed for that purpose. The pamphlet had a sudden and surprising effect. I was call'd upon for the instrument of association, and having settled the draft of it with a few friends, I appointed a meeting of the citizens in the large building before mentioned. The house was pretty full; I had prepared a number of printed copies, and provided pens and ink dispers'd all over the room. I harangued them a little on the subject, read the paper, and explained it, and then distributed the copies, which were eagerly signed, not the least objection being made.

When the company separated and the papers were collected we found above twelve hundred hands; and, other copies being dispersed in the country, the subscribers amounted at length to upward of ten thousand. These all furnished themselves as soon as they could with arms, formed themselves into companies and regiments, chose their own officers, and met every week to be instructed in the manual exercise and other parts of military discipline. The women, by subscriptions among themselves, provided silk colors, which they presented to the companies, painted with different devices and mottoes, which I supplied.

The officers of the companies composing the Philadelphia regiment, being met, chose me for their colonel; but, conceiving myself unfit, I declin'd that station and recommended Mr. Lawrence, a fine person, a man of influence, who was accordingly appointed. I then propos'd a lottery to defray the expense of building a battery below the town and furnishing it with cannon. It fill'd expeditiously and the battery was soon erected, the merlons being fram'd of logs and fill'd with earth. We bought some old cannon from Boston, but, these not being sufficient, we wrote to England for more, soliciting, at the same time, our proprietaries for some assistance, tho' without much expectation of obtaining it.

Meanwhile Colonel Lawrence, William Allen, Abram Taylor, Esqr., and myself were sent to New York by the associators, commission'd to borrow some cannon of Governor Clinton. He at first refus'd us peremptorily; but at dinner with his council, where there was great drinking of Madeira wine, as the custom of that place then was, he softened by degrees and said he would lend us six. After a few more bumpers he advanc'd to ten, and at length he very good-naturedly conceded eighteen. They were fine cannon, eighteen-pounders, with their carriages, which we soon transported and mounted on our battery, where the associators kept a nightly guard while the war lasted, and among the rest I regularly took my turn of duty there as a common soldier.

There is much more of this to show that they were as intensely human in those days as we are to-day, but that they were even a little more frank about it. [Laughter.]

But having referred to the activities of the Poor Richard Club in celebrating Franklin's birthday, and on this day laying a memorial on his grave, I wish to quote just a few words that Franklin himself said about his creation of the character of Poor Richard:

In 1732 I first publish'd my Almanack, under the name of Richard Saunders; it was continu'd by me about twenty-five years, commonly call'd Poor Richard's Almanack. I endeavor'd to make it both entertaining and useful, and it accordingly came to be in such demand that I reap'd considerable profit from it, vending annually near ten thousand. And observing that it was generally read, scarce any neighborhood in the Province being without it, I consider'd it as a proper vehicle for conveying instruction among the common people, who bought scarcely any other books. I therefore fill'd all the little spaces that occurred between the remarkable days in the calendar with proverbial sentences, chiefly such as inculcated industry and frugality, as the means of procuring wealth, and thereby securing virtue, it being more difficult for a man in want to act always honestly as, to use here one of these proverbs, It is hard for an empty sack to stand upright.

These proverbs, which contain the wisdom of many ages and nations, I assembled and formed into a connected discourse, prefix'd to the Almanack of 1757, as the harangue of a wise old man to the people attending an auction. The bringing all these scattered counsels thus into a focus enabled them to make greater impression. The piece, being universally approved, was copied in all the newspapers of the continent, reprinted in Britain on a broadside, to be stuck up in houses; two translations were made of it in French, and great numbers bought by the clergy and gentry to distribute gratis among their

poor parishioners and tenants. In Pennsylvania, as it discouraged useless expense in foreign superfluities, some thought it had its share of influence in producing that growing plenty of money which was observable for several years after its publication.

And just here, before closing, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that previous to his success in publishing the sayings of Poor Richard, this sturdy American, who attained so great a celebrity as to win the attention of the nations, was as modestly human as the rest of us, as indicated in a humorous prologue to his almanac, published along with the first issue in 1733:

The plain truth of the matter is—

He wrote—

I am excessive poor, and my wife, good woman, is, I tell her, excessive proud; she can not bear, she says, to sit spinning in her shift of tow while I do nothing but gaze at the stars, and has threatened more than once to burn all my books and rattling traps (as she calls my instruments) if I do not make some profitable use of them for my family. The printer has offered me some considerable share of the profits, and I have thus begun to comply with my dame's desire.

So the lady of the house was as much in evidence then as she is now, and in the matter of fashions was impelled by motives of style and taste somewhat similar in degree to those that prevail to-day, and the great Franklin, diplomat and philosopher that he was, was generous enough to admit, like any other good husband who wished to keep up with the times, that he actually "needed the money." [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] is recognized.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to use any more time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill H. R. 3954, with amendments.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

DUPLICATE CHECKS OR WARRANTS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 3636) to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as reenacted and amended by act of February 23, 1909.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3636) to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as reenacted and amended by act of February 23, 1909.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3646 of the Revised Statutes be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3646. That whenever any original check is lost, stolen, or destroyed disbursing officers and agents of the United States are authorized, within three years from the date of such check, to issue a duplicate check under such regulations in regard to its issue and payment, and upon the execution of such bond, with sureties, to indemnify the United States, and proof of loss of original check, as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That whenever any original check or warrant of the Post Office Department has been lost, stolen, or destroyed the Postmaster General may authorize the issuance of a duplicate thereof, at any time within three years from the date of such original check or warrant, upon the execution by the owner thereof of such bond of indemnity as the Postmaster General may prescribe: *Provided further*, That when such original check or warrant does not exceed in amount the sum of \$50 and the payee or owner is, at the date of the application, an officer or employee in the service of the Post Office Department, whether by contract, designation, or appointment, the Postmaster General may, in lieu of an indemnity bond, authorize the issuance of a duplicate check or warrant upon such an affidavit as he may prescribe, to be made before any postmaster by the payee or owner of an original check or warrant."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. LINDBERGH. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is this bill intended to apply to some particular persons, or is it a bill that applies to conditions generally? It has reference to a good many cases, has it not?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I will say that this bill is a matter of general legislation. In order to explain the general purposes of it, I will say that the people who at the present time I have chiefly in mind are pensioners. In case a pension voucher is lost, either with or without the fault of the pensioner, the Treasury Department can not, without such an authority as this, if the amount is over \$50, issue a duplicate within six months. At the present time with these old men six months is a long period. Hence I introduced the bill in order to reach that class. When it was submitted to the Pension Office it was approved, and when submitted to the Treasury Department they suggested a different draft of the bill, in which the Treasury Department is given authority to prescribe regulations such as it deems best, covering all the vouchers of the Treasury Department; and that is the bill that is here pending. It has the approval of that department as well as of the Pension Office. It passed this House in the last Congress, but in the crush of business in the Senate at the close of the session it did not receive action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 19, on page 2, insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That disbursing officers and agents of the United States are authorized and directed, in the settlement of pensions, to make a monthly payment to all persons borne upon the rolls who can furnish satisfactory proof that they are without an income exceeding \$500 over and above the pension now paid to them."

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I make a point of order on that. I do not think it is germane to the bill pending.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. FRANCIS RIVER, MO. AND ARK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4716) to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across St. Francis River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at a place known as Browns Ferry, about 4 miles west of Holcomb, Dunklin County, State of Missouri, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "at," near the end of the line, insert the words "or near."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. FRANCIS RIVER, MO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across St. Francis River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the township line between townships 22 and 23, range 8 east, in Dunklin and Butler Counties, in the State of Missouri, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

SALARIES IN THE PATENT OFFICE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 900) amending sections 476, 477, and 440 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, pending a statement from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 476 of the Revised Statutes be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 476. There shall be in the Patent Office a Commissioner of Patents, one first assistant commissioner, one assistant commissioner, and five examiners in chief, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The first assistant commissioner and the assistant commissioner shall perform such duties pertaining to the office of commissioner as may be assigned to them, respec-

tively, from time to time by the Commissioner of Patents. All other officers, clerks, and employees authorized by law for the office shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior upon the nomination of the Commissioner of Patents, in accordance with existing law."

Sec. 2. That section 477 of the Revised Statutes be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 477. The salaries of the officers mentioned in the preceding section shall be as follows:

- "The Commissioner of Patents, \$5,000 a year.
- "The First Assistant Commissioners of Patents, \$4,500 a year.
- "The Assistant Commissioner of Patents, \$3,500 a year.
- "Five examiners in chief, \$3,500 a year each."

Sec. 3. That so much of section 440 of the Revised Statutes as follows the words "In the Patent Office," and refers to said office only, be amended to read as follows:

"One chief clerk, who shall be qualified to act as a principal examiner.

- "One librarian, who shall be qualified to act as an assistant examiner.
- "Five law examiners.
- "One examiner of classification.
- "One examiner of interferences.
- "One examiner of trade-marks and designs.
- "One first assistant examiner of trade-marks and designs.
- "Six assistant examiners of trade-marks and designs.
- "Forty-three principal examiners.
- "Eighty-six first assistant examiners.
- "Eighty-six second assistant examiners.
- "Eighty-six third assistant examiners.
- "Eighty-six fourth assistant examiners; and such other examiners and assistant examiners in the various grades as the Congress shall from time to time provide for."

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that this bill should be passed by unanimous consent at this time.

Mr. MANN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that this bill was passed in the last House, I think, by unanimous consent, after it had been amended? I think it was amended somewhat to conform to the views of the gentleman from New York. I am not interested in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MORRISON] to have the bill passed over, so that it can come up on the next unanimous-consent day. My purpose in doing so is this: The preparation of the legislative bill has just commenced. The gentleman in charge of the bill wanted to have an opportunity to go into this question with the Commissioner of Patents. The bill involves providing additional assistants in the Patent Office. After the examination it may be that the gentlemen may get together.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman had better ask to have it passed over. This bill was agreed upon by everybody in the last Congress and passed both Houses.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know; but bills that pass by unanimous consent do not always have very much substantial argument from that fact in their favor.

Mr. MANN. This was not passed the first time it came up by unanimous consent, by a long shot.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it should be passed over temporarily.

Mr. MORRISON. I have no objection to its being passed over temporarily, provided that it can be called up later during the day.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no. I object to its being brought up to-day. Let it go over and reserve its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TUG FORK OF THE BIG SANDY RIVER, KY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 306) granting the consent of Congress to William H. Preece, of Inez, Ky., to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River, Ky., at or near Warfield, Ky.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to William H. Preece, of Inez, Ky., and his successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Warfield, Ky., in the County of Martin, in the State of Kentucky, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. This bill seems to be a purely private bill, and I object to it for the same reason that I objected to the others.

The SPEAKER. It is a bridge bill.

Mr. LINDBERGH. It is a private bill, and I object.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 1773, a bill of like import to the one just read, and substitute it for the House bill, and amend the Senate bill by inserting the words "Warfield, Kentucky, and" in line 9, page 1, after the word "near,"

and that the title be amended accordingly. I move that we pass the Senate bill as amended and that the House bill lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] moves to suspend the rules and take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1773, and pass the same with an amendment, which the Clerk will read into it. The Clerk will read the entire bill, with the amendment in.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH] makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-nine Members are present—not a quorum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the vote on this call of the House include a vote on my motion?

The SPEAKER. No; this is simply a roll call.

Mr. LANGLEY. I did not quite understand whether we had gone far enough to include a vote on my motion in this call or not.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adamson	Dyer	Igoe	Paige, Mass.
Allen	Fairchild	Jones	Parker, N. Y.
Bacharach	Farley	Keister	Patten
Barchfeld	Fields	Kent	Platt
Beales	Finley	Key, Ohio	Porter
Bennet	Flynn	Kiess, Pa.	Pratt
Brown, W. Va.	Focht	Kitchin	Rauch
Bruckner	Frear	Kreider	Reilly
Brumbaugh	Gallagher	Lafean	Riordan
Caldwell	Gallivan	Lieb	Rowland
Carew	Gardner	Linthicum	Sabath
Casey	Garland	Loft	Scott, Pa.
Chandler, N. Y.	Glass	Longworth	Scully
Chipherfield	Graham	Loud	Sells
Coady	Gray, Ala.	McLemore	Siegel
Cullop	Gray, N. J.	Magee	Slomp
Dale, N. Y.	Gregg	Maher	Snell
Darrow	Guernsey	Mays	Snyder
Davenport	Hamill	Meeker	Sparkman
Dempsey	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller, Pa.	Stout
Denison	Haskell	Mondell	Summers
Dies	Haugen	Mooney	Tague
Dill	Hill	Morgan, La.	Treadway
Doelling	Hilliard	Moss, W. Va.	Vare
Doremus	Holland	Mott	Ward
Drukner	Howell	Mudd	Whaley
Dunn	Hulbert	Nolan	Winslow
Dupré	Hutchinson	Olney	Wise

The SPEAKER. On this call 319 Members—a quorum—have answered to their names.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors, a quorum being present. The Clerk will report the bill and read into it the amendments.

The bill (S. 1773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va., was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That W. H. Preece and associates (or the Interstate Bridge Co., a corporation organized under the laws of Kentucky), their (or its) successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va., in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 23, 1906, entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters."

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH] demands a second, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH] has 20 minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual form of bill granting authority for the construction of a bridge across an interstate stream. Gentlemen of the House understand, I take

it, all about the proposition, so that it is not necessary for me to debate it, and I shall not occupy the time to which I am entitled under the rules unless some one else desires to be heard or to interrogate me regarding it. My bill, which has been unanimously reported by the committee and is now on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, was introduced for the purpose of getting authority for some constituents of mine, who are gentlemen of high standing and entirely responsible, to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River. The Senate bill is of slightly different phraseology but its purpose is the same, and in order to expedite the matter I have made the motion to substitute the Senate bill for mine. There is a great deal of development going on along the Tug River, and the point at which it is desired to construct this bridge is becoming quite an important commercial community. The river there is not fordable during a large part of the year, so that a bridge is badly needed. The Senate bill does not describe the location of what I regard as the more important end of the proposed bridge—the Kentucky end—which is to be at or near Warfield, Ky., and the amendment which I have offered is to accomplish that.

I have no desire to take the time of the House myself, but I desire to assure Members that it is a meritorious bill in every respect and I hope it will pass. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANGLEY. I have yielded to the gentleman from Minnesota, but I will yield later to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LINDBERGH. What does the gentleman mean by this language?

At a point suitable to the interest of navigation.

Is this bridge in aid of navigation?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; that is the language that is usually put in such bills. It means that the bridge must be constructed subject to the regulations of the War Department, the Tug River being a navigable stream.

Mr. LINDBERGH. What is the bridge to be used for?

Mr. LANGLEY. A highway bridge for ordinary traffic.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Is it to be a toll bridge?

Mr. LANGLEY. I assume that it will be a toll bridge, although I have not been specifically advised as to that. A private corporation is being organized to build it, and, of course, it must be their purpose to make it a toll bridge, unless the local county authorities should decide to purchase it and make it a free bridge, which is sometimes done. However, I know nothing personally about that phase of the matter. I simply know that a bridge is needed there, and I am trying to help pave the way for it.

Mr. LINDBERGH. That is all I wish to ask the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the House whether there is any opposition to this bill in the locality?

Mr. LANGLEY. Oh, none whatever that I have heard of. The bill has been pending for nearly a month and a half. I introduced it the first day of the session, and I have not been advised of the slightest opposition.

I will say further to the gentleman, repeating myself somewhat, that the junior Senator from Kentucky introduced the bill in the Senate and it has passed that body. I introduced a similar bill in the House, which has been unanimously reported by the House committee and is on the calendar. In order to expedite the matter I am asking that the Senate bill be passed and that my bill be laid on the table. That is all the explanation I desire to make.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules, taking this bill from the Speaker's table, and passing it with the amendments which have been read into it.

The question being taken and two-thirds voting in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill passed.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, does that action include amending the title, as suggested by me?

The SPEAKER. The amendment to the title was included in the title as read.

RURAL POST ROADS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I had that bill put on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent some days ago, but since

that time a different arrangement has been made, and I will ask that it be passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks to pass the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That it be stricken off this calendar.

Mr. MANN. I object. That will strike it off the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and that takes it off the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

FISH HATCHERY IN OKLAHOMA.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 403) granting to the State of Oklahoma permission to occupy a certain portion of the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., and to maintain and operate thereon a fish hatchery.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Oklahoma is hereby granted permission to enter upon and occupy, for the purpose of operating and maintaining thereon a fish hatchery for the propagation of fish for public distribution to the people of said State, and in pursuance thereof to construct ponds, drain the land, plant grass, shrubbery and trees, and otherwise improve and beautify the area to be occupied, the following-described tract of land within the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., viz.: All that portion of said reservation lying and being within the boundary lines described as beginning at the northeast corner of section 19 in township 3 north, range 12 west, Indian meridian, and extending thence west along the section line a distance of 1,820 feet to a point in the center of Medicine Bluff Creek; thence in a southeasterly direction, following the center line of Medicine Bluff Creek, to a point 200 feet west of the east line and 1,700 feet south of the north line of said section 19; thence 200 feet east of the section line between said section 19 and section 20; thence north on the section line between said sections 19 and 20 a distance of 1,700 feet to the point of beginning, said tract containing an area of 39.5 acres more or less: *Provided*, That the occupation and use of the said land for the aforesaid purpose shall in no manner affect the rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to said lands; nor the Government's rights of passage over and across the lands so occupied: *Provided further*, That the United States shall not be liable for any damages whatsoever that may at any time occur to the improvements of the State of Oklahoma on said lands: *And provided further*, That the exercise of the rights hereby granted and the execution of any work on said lands hereby authorized shall be in accordance with such plans and specifications as may be approved by the Secretary of War and subject to such further stipulations and conditions as he may prescribe.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the present consideration of this bill, though it is not on the call for to-day. I think it ought to be understood that hereafter the rule in reference to three days on the calendar will, in the main, be enforced.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; but I hope the gentleman will not object to this.

Mr. MANN. I say I shall not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following committee amendment was read:

Page 3, line 3, after the word "prescribe," insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to revoke the permission herein granted, if in his judgment it is necessary for the use of such military reservation by the War Department."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent to consider it in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to have the gentleman make a brief statement of the bill, so that Members of the House may know what it provides.

Mr. FERRIS. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. MANN. That instead of asking the Government of the United States to maintain a fish hatchery in Oklahoma, as other States have asked the Government to maintain hatcheries within their boundaries, what this bill does is to grant permission to the State of Oklahoma to maintain a hatchery at State expense; an example which other States might well follow.

For several years my district has insisted on my getting a fish hatchery from the Government, but I have never been able to do so. Last year the State appropriated \$25,000 and built a fish hatchery, and now they want a little corner of this 56,000-acre military reservation to put a few ponds on, and we ask a revocable permit from the Government to establish on that little corner of this reserve, 7 or 8 miles away, these little ponds.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. I am in harmony with the gentleman's bill, but Oklahoma is not the only State that seeks this privilege.

In fact, many States have already exercised it, and I want to say that Illinois does more work in the line of fish hatching for the streams of Illinois than does the Federal Government.

Mr. FERRIS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. It affords me some gratification, because I was afraid I was alone in failing to secure a Federal appropriation for that purpose.

The War Department drew this bill, and recommends that the bill pass. It only seeks to occupy a remote corner of this large reservation. It is a revocable permit, so that the Government can retake it at any time it sees fit.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What committee reported the bill?

Mr. FERRIS. The Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I want to say that I have had a bill before Congress for some time for a fish hatchery in Texas, but I have not yet been able to secure it. We have only one fish hatchery in the State of Texas, and that is 500 miles from where I live. I hope that we shall soon get a report on that bill.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman a military reservation in his district?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS TUG FORK, BIG SANDY RIVER.

The SPEAKER. The bill (S. 1773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River, and so forth, was a Senate bill. The bill H. R. 306, of the same tenor, without objection, will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent will be passed, as it has not been on the calendar the requisite three days. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for one hour under a special order.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 11 years I have been a Member of this House and for a goodly portion of that time I have been a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I have served one term as the chairman of that committee and have just entered upon my second term as chairman of that committee.

Mr. Speaker, believing that my experience upon the committee mentioned justifies me, I desire to submit a few remarks to the House and the country on the public-building operations of the United States. It seems to me that the many articles which have appeared in the public press of the country during the past three or four years condemning the committee and holding up the Congress itself to public scorn and ridicule for alleged indulgence in "pork-barrel" legislation demand from some one a plain, simple statement of the real facts, if nothing more.

The storm of ridicule and abuse of the committee and of Congress for what has been designated "pork-barrel" legislation was brought into being by certain sensational metropolitan newspapers and saffron-colored magazines and has been so assiduously nurtured by the same agencies that the general public has begun to believe that the chief occupation of the average Member of Congress is the plundering of the Public Treasury for the sole benefit of his particular district. In fact, it has been made to appear that public-building bills have been framed with no regard whatever to the needs of the public service, without reference to the public revenues, with entire disregard of all economic administration, and have been constructed solely upon the idea of giving to every Member of Congress and Senator a slice of the pie.

If these things are true, if Members of Congress are actuated in their legislative conduct by no higher motive than to grab from the Public Treasury all they can get for their own districts, regardless of the merits of the particular proposition, then they are unworthy to be here and should be mercilessly driven by an indignant people from the high places which they dishonor. But, Mr. Speaker, my 11 years of service in this House, my knowledge of its membership during all those years, my close association with the rank and file of this great body, and my fixed, immovable confidence in the integrity of the American House of Representatives all give the lie to these villainous insinuations. [Applause.]

During my humble service here I have seen many men come and go. Some have voluntarily retired from the service, either

to private life or to enter upon the duties of some other station; some have gone down in defeat while seeking reelection; and some, answering the last call, "have crossed over the river and now rest under the shade of the trees." Looking back over the Congresses in which I have been permitted to serve, I can truthfully proclaim that nowhere upon the earth can a more upright, honorable, and patriotic body of men be found than is the American House of Representatives. [Applause.] We may and do differ as to the means of reaching the end, but I do believe that in the heart of every Member upon this floor, and uppermost in that heart, is a sincere and honest desire to reach that end which will best conduce to the honor and glory of the United States. We who are native born love the States from which we hail; those of us who were born on foreign shores love the fatherland; but over and above all we love this glorious Republic, an indissoluble Union of indestructible States, over which floats Old Glory, proud emblem of liberty now and forevermore. [Applause.]

Men representing a Government like this, in a country like this, can not be guilty of the petty pilfering laid at our door by these sensational yellow publications, and this I intend to demonstrate in words and figures so plain that "a wayfaring man, though a fool he be, need not err therein." In the first place, Mr. Speaker, let me say that no politics has ever entered into the deliberations of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It has been a strictly nonpartisan committee, both under Republican and Democratic control. The question of a Member's party affiliation has never been considered in passing on a bill; the merit of the proposition itself was the only thing in each case to which the committee gave thought. No one has ever attempted to make of this a partisan committee, and therefore I was pained a few months ago when a distinguished Republican of the State of Massachusetts, well known to all of us, in an attack on the present Democratic administration, made the astounding statement that if the Democrats would quit squandering so much money on magnificent public buildings in small towns in the South that there would be plenty of money for the legitimate purposes of the Government. I shall not retort by saying that Republican Congresses "squandered" money in public buildings—on the contrary, I expect to show that no Congress, Republican or Democratic, has "squandered" money on public buildings—but I will remind this distinguished gentleman of the fact that the Democrats have not yet passed an omnibus public-building bill, and therefore could not have "squandered" any money on "magnificent public buildings in small towns in the South." The last omnibus public-building bill passed by Congress was approved by President Taft on March 4, 1913, and at that time we had a Republican Senate and a Democratic House. We have had no general public-building bill since the Democrats have been in control of Congress and the Presidency, and, therefore, if there has been any squandering of the public funds on account of public-building legislation it can not be charged to the Democratic Party.

But let us see what the facts are. I intend to appeal from the reckless, sensational statements made by the yellow press, and gleefully repeated by a few alleged statesmen industriously trying to hold onto their jobs by posing as watchdogs of the Treasury in their attacks on public improvements, congressional mileage, a superfluity of janitors, and other like weighty questions of statecraft, to the actual record. [Laughter and applause.]

Congress has been viciously assailed for wasteful extravagance in the matter of the provision for and the construction of public buildings throughout the country. The bills coming from this committee have been referred to as "pork-barrel" bills, and the public has been deceived into believing that in the construction of these general bills it has simply been a matter of "you tickle me and I'll tickle you," without any regard to the merits of the proposition or the needs of the public service whatsoever. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I deny that there has been any appreciable waste of the public money in public-building construction; and, in the second place, I assert without the slightest fear of successful contradiction that if there has been any waste of public money in Federal-building construction, the responsibility therefor can not be laid at the door of Congress. I shall address myself to the latter proposition first, and will recur to the former later on in my remarks. In order to convince the House and the country that Congress is not responsible for any waste of public funds in Federal-building construction, I have only to refer to the law itself. Let it be understood that Congress does not construct public buildings. All we can do is to authorize their construction and furnish the means therefor. Some other governmental agency must attend to the actual construction of the buildings, and Congress, by solemn enactment, has charged the Treasury Department with this duty. In the very nature of things it is utterly impossible

for Congress to determine to the dollar what a public building for each and every city and town in the United States should cost, and therefore a measure of discretion had to be lodged in the executive department charged with their construction.

This being the case, Congress in every item of every general public-building bill has left the cost in the discretion of the Treasury Department. We have never enacted that a specific sum of money should be expended in the construction of a Government building at a particular place, but in each and every case we have fixed the maximum of cost beyond which the Treasury Department could not go. For instance, where we provided for a building at a given place with an authorization of \$100,000 we have always expressly fixed that amount as the "limit of cost," and if in such case the department, in its discretion, felt that a \$50,000 building would answer the purpose, there has never been anything to hinder the construction of a cheaper building. If, therefore, magnificent, monumental buildings have been constructed in one-horse, crossroads towns, where the business of the Government did not demand it, and thereby the money of the people has been needlessly wasted, the fault lies at the door of the Treasury Department and is not chargeable to us. "Thou can'st not shake thy gory head at us and say, Thou did'st it."

The last public-building bill passed by Congress was approved March 4, 1913, when we had a Democratic House and a Republican President and Senate. The next preceding omnibus public-building bill was approved June 25, 1910, at which time the House, Senate, and President were all Republican. The next preceding general omnibus public-building bill was approved on May 30, 1908, at which time the House, Senate, and President were all Republican. These three bills carried an aggregate authorization in round numbers of some \$104,000,000, or an average of about \$13,000,000 per annum. From the year 1908, when the first of these omnibus public-building bills was passed, until the present time Congress has passed a number of individual public-building bills; that is to say, bills providing for buildings at particular places. These individual and separate items have amounted in round numbers to some \$13,000,000. Upon a calculation it will be shown that about half of the \$117,000,000 which has been authorized within the last eight years has been authorized to be expended in cities of 25,000 population and over, and the remaining half has been authorized to be expended in cities under 25,000 population. Adding these miscellaneous and separate acts to the three omnibus bills, it will show an authorization of something over \$14,000,000 during the past eight years for public building construction in the United States annually. Thus it will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that practically half of all the money authorized by us in the construction of public buildings in this country for the past eight years has gone to cities of 25,000 and over, while the rural communities, which I venture to say, if it could be correctly arrived at, pay into the Treasury much more than half the taxes of the country, have received the other half. If this calculation should be made upon the basis of cities and towns with more than 10,000 population and those with a population under that figure, it would be found, in my judgment, that the cities of more than 10,000 population have received a much larger proportion of these funds than they are entitled to if measured by the amount paid into the Treasury in the way of taxes. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Congress has not dealt unjustly, but, on the other hand, has dealt in a very liberal way with the large cities of the country. But, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the facts as disclosed by the record, a certain element of the metropolitan press and a certain class of magazines denounce us as "pork-barrel devotees" or "looters of the Treasury" every time we propose to construct a modest public building in a live, progressive, wide-awake town in the rural districts, but when we propose to expend millions for the erection of a marble palace in one of the great cities of the country we are pictured as broad-minded, progressive, and patriotic statesmen. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department is about five years behind in its work, and there is not the slightest prospect under existing methods of ever catching up. There are to my mind two reasons why that bureau or branch of the service is so far behind. One reason is the fact that some years ago the then Secretary of the Treasury, without authority of law, issued orders to his subordinates that they were only to construct in one year 25 per cent of the buildings provided for in a general public-building bill but recently passed. Thus it will be seen that with one stroke of the pen and in utter contempt for the will of Congress these buildings were thrown three years behind. I want to say right here that this practice of executive departments issuing orders which practically have the effect of nullifying acts of Congress has grown to such proportions and has been so long and persistently

practiced until the departmental veto has come to be recognized as a legitimate governmental function. Congress is no longer the supreme power in matters of legislation. We, the chosen representatives of the people, selected by popular vote every two years, charged with the duty of writing into the law of the land the will of the sovereign citizenship of the Republic, sit supinely by while mere appointees of the Executive set aside and declare null and void our most solemn enactments. We have tamely submitted to Executive encroachments for so long, we have for so many years given the world such an example of spineless statesmanship, and have with such unconcerned complacency witnessed the Executive appropriation of practically all our prerogatives that even the janitors and messengers of executive departments no longer have respect for the House of Representatives, but instead appear to have a pitying contempt for what they regard as a harmless aggregation of legislative mollycoddles. [Laughter and applause.] How long shall this condition continue? Shall we assert ourselves and again become the vigorous, virile, powerful legislative force which we once were and which it was intended by the fathers of the Republic we should be, or shall we continue to drag out the miserable existence of a dwarfish, misshapen legislative eunuch? [Laughter and applause.] It is up to us, my friends. Which road shall we travel?

Mr. Speaker, I think we will all agree that from every viewpoint it is desirable to have the Supervising Architect's Office keep abreast of the building operations of the Government. It is neither in the interest of economy nor is it in the interest of good administration to have this or any other branch of the public service five or six years behind in its work. It is better in governmental affairs, as it is better in individual affairs, to drive your work rather than have your work drive you. If it is conceded that it is desirable to catch up and keep up with this important work of the Government, the question How can it be done? naturally arises. Mr. Speaker, I have given a good deal of thought to this question, and I believe that two things are absolutely necessary to be done in order to accomplish the desired result.

First, I believe it is absolutely necessary to reorganize the Office of the Supervising Architect, and place at the head of it a first-class architect who is also a practical, common-sense man of good executive ability. I admit that this combination is hard to find, as most good architects are, as a rule, impractical, visionary dreamers; but there are some who measure up to the requirement, and I have in mind now a gentleman who, in my judgment, will fully meet the requirements in this particular case.

Second, Standardization of buildings wherever possible. This question of standardizing has been much discussed, and most of the architects are opposed to the idea. But, Mr. Speaker, it requires no technical architectural knowledge to know that the plan is entirely feasible. [Applause.] It is not only feasible, but good business judgment demands it as a saver of both time and money in public-building construction.

I am fully aware that both climate and the topography of the country are to be considered, but from the first floor up a standard type can be used no matter what "the lay of the land" or climatic conditions may be. But, Mr. Speaker, my plan of standardization would be to divide the States of the Union into groups with particular reference to climate and topography, and then divide the cities and towns of each group into classes. For instance, I would form one group of the New England States, which for my present purposes I shall call "Group A." I would then take all the towns or cities in group A where the annual postal receipts were from ten to twenty-five thousand dollars and I would designate this as "class 1." I would then have the Supervising Architect draft plans and specifications for a post-office building for a town in class 1 of group A, and these plans and specifications would answer for every town of this class and group. It is absolutely nonsensical to tell me that a post-office building suitable for a certain-sized town in New Hampshire would not be equally suitable for the same-sized town in Rhode Island, or that a post-office building for a certain-sized town in Mississippi would not be equally suitable for a town of like size in Louisiana. A plan of this kind would save to the Government annually a large sum in the drafting of new plans, to say nothing of the immense saving in the matter of time.

In addition to the saving in the drafting of plans and time standardization would result in a tremendous saving in the cost of construction, and would also result in the erection of a class of buildings much better suited to the purposes of the Government from the standpoint of utility than those we are now getting. Of course in advocating standardization I am

speaking with particular reference to those buildings which are to be used solely for post-office purposes.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Is the position of Supervising Architect of the Treasury still under the civil service?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; but it is vacant now.

Mr. KAHN. Before anybody could be appointed he would have to pass the civil-service examination and be near the top of the eligible list, would he not?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Under the present law; yes.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say here that the post-office building of the future should be essentially a workshop. It should be constructed with a view to utility and comfort rather than with a view to outside architectural beauty. The truth of the whole business is that the waste and extravagance of the past is chargeable directly to the fact that the esthetic dreamers who have been in the Supervising Architect's Office have sacrificed the utility of the building and the comfort of the workers therein to the gimeracks and curly cues of architecture. [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that with a common-sense system of standardization and a competent, level-headed architect with executive ability in charge of the Supervising Architect's Office we can effect a saving of at least 40 per cent in the building operations of the Government, have more and better buildings, and catch up with the work in less than three years.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that we should not have an omnibus public-building bill at this session of Congress, and I have heard but two reasons given in support of that contention. I desire to say right here that so far as I am personally concerned it makes very little difference to me whether we have a bill or not. I have only one town in my district unprovided for which, under the rule, is entitled to a public building. That town is already provided with a site, and if we have a general bill I shall in all human probability simply ask for a building on the site already secured. It seems to me that under these conditions I should be acquitted of any selfish motive in what I am about to say.

The objections to the passage of an omnibus public-building bill are:

First. That the Supervising Architect is so far behind in his work that it is unnecessary and useless at this time to authorize any further construction.

Mr. Speaker, this is no excuse at all. We can reorganize that office and soon have its work abreast of the authorizations. There is no question of this; and, second, that we are short of funds and can not afford it just now. We can not afford it, we are told, because we will need all the money we can raise for "preparedness." Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of reasonable "preparedness," but if "preparedness" means stoppage of all progress, if it means that all the works of internal improvement must cease, then I am against "preparedness" "tooth and nail," "forever and a day." In this question of "preparedness" a great and unexpected emergency confronts the country. The expense incident to it ought not to be paid out of the current revenues of the Government. It is an unexpected and extraordinary expense to be incurred more for the protection of the future than for the safety of the present, and therefore the logical and proper way to meet it is by an issue of bonds, using the current revenues for the ordinary expenses of the Government, including river and harbor improvements and the construction, enlargement, and repair of public buildings.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that some of our friends who are so extremely anxious to meet the desire of the people for an economic administration of public affairs have entirely forgotten the meaning of economy. One of the great reasons, in my humble judgment, which moved the people to turn the Republicans out and put us in in 1912 was the desire of the people for greater economy in public affairs. But the people did not mean by that verdict that they wanted all river and harbor improvement and public-building construction to cease; they simply wanted us to give them the same things which they had been getting for less money than our Republican friends had been giving it to them for. A cessation of progress is not economy; it is simply stagnation and dry-rot. Any man can save money by cutting off one meal a day; but that is not economy—it is pure cussedness and niggardliness. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, a great hue and cry has been raised in some of the metropolitan newspapers and some of the magazines of the country over the construction of public buildings in some of the smaller cities and towns, particularly in the West and South. These publications have had so much to say about "pork," "spoils," "looting the Treasury," and so forth, that all public-building legislation has been brought into ill repute in the

minds of a great many good people. I desire for a short time to discuss this feature of the public-building activities of the Government and answer, if I may be able, the indictment which has been drawn and filed against the manner in which the work has been carried on. Let me assert in the beginning that it is beneath the dignity of this great Republic to occupy the position of a tenant for quarters in which to conduct the public business. Mr. Speaker, when this great Republic was born among the nations of the earth it was never once thought by the great men who established it that government among men was to be a money-making institution. The patriots of those days expected, and rightly expected, that the people who were to inhabit this God-favored land would be willing to pay for Government protection of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." They never dreamed that in the years to come a class of alleged statesmen would be found upon this floor seriously debating the question as to whether a certain proposed legislative enactment would be remunerative to the Government or not; they never supposed that men deemed worthy to represent 200,000 free-born American citizens in this great body would be sent here to waste hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money annually in a demagogic *opéra bouffe* effort to cut down the mileage of Members; they did not believe that the American public would ever reach that stage of avarice and venality where their only concern about proposed legislation was whether or not it would pay. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are intelligent, broad minded, and patriotic. They want the best, and they are willing to pay for it. It has been suggested, and in some quarters it is strongly insisted, that a public building should not be erected at any place where the rent is less than the interest on the cost of a building plus the upkeep charges. I take issue with this contention, and shall endeavor briefly to give some of the reasons which impel me to take this position. I freely concede that this question of financial profit or loss should be considered, but I do most emphatically deny that this should be the controlling factor. In determining whether the Government should construct and occupy its own building in a given town quite a number of matters should be taken into consideration.

First. The present and prospective importance of the town, with particular reference to the volume of public business transacted there, and the probability of its increase in the near future. We now have a statute in which Congress has declared that in those places where there is no Federal activity other than the post office no site can be purchased where the postal receipts do not amount to at least \$7,000 and no building can be authorized where the postal receipts do not amount to at least \$10,000 annually. This rule was written into the law of the land in the Sixty-second Congress after conference between the two Houses and mature deliberation. So that your committee, in determining whether a public building should be constructed at a given place, not only investigates the postal receipts for the past year, but looks into the receipts for several years past, examines into the growth in population, business, and so forth, in order to determine as to the stability of the town and the likelihood of the continuance of its growth.

Second. The amount of rent being paid by the Government, the character of building occupied, and its distance from the railroad station or stations or steamboat wharves.

Sometimes we find that the rent is merely nominal, with the object of having the post office located in a certain section of the town. Sometimes we find that while the Government is paying a very small rental the office is located in a veritable fire trap, which is not only dangerous but a positive disgrace to a great Government like ours. Very frequently we find that the post office is located more than 80 rods from the depot or wharf, which entails on the Government the additional cost of carrying the mails from the depot or wharf to the post office and from the post office to the depot or wharf.

Mr. Speaker, it is proper for me to state here that in all towns or cities where the post office is located within 80 rods of the depot or wharf to which mail is brought the railroad or steamboat company, as the case may be, is compelled under the law to deliver that mail at the post office, and I have in mind now one city in the United States where the Government is under contract to pay, and is paying, \$200,000 per annum for the hauling of the mail to and fro between the post office and the railway stations. I want to say in this connection that in every case of a new building your committee is, and has been for some years past, trying to locate it within this 80-rod limit.

Third. Whether any Federal activities other than the post office are located at that particular place. We do this because sometimes we find, particularly in the South and West, small towns whose postal receipts do not quite reach the required

amount, but where, in addition to the post office, there is a Federal court, land office, or some other Federal activity which must be housed.

Fourth. The location of the town. That is to say, whether it is a railroad or mining center or the center of a vast territory, growing rapidly and with an unquestionable future.

These are some of the principal matters, Mr. Speaker, into which your committee makes inquiry in determining the location of a public building for the use of the Government.

I hold no brief for the committee in what I am about to say, but speaking for myself alone, and as an individual member of this great body, I want to say that there are some other considerations which move me and operate upon my mind when giving attention to the matter of constructing Federal buildings in the smaller cities and towns, and particularly those of the interior. The great rural population of this country constitutes the very "bone and sinew" of the land—the backbone of the Republic. If I had the time, I believe I could show that they pay the great bulk of the taxes necessary to support the Government in times of peace, and God knows that in times of war the American country boy follows Old Glory where "thickest falls the red rain of human slaughter." He sees very little of the blessings of government beyond the post office and the rural carrier, and if I had the power I would erect for every presidential post office throughout the broad domain of the Republic a Government building representative of the sovereignty and the glory of this great country. From Maine to California and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, in every town of sufficient importance to have the President name the postmaster, I would erect a suitable but not extravagant building, and from its apex the Stars and Stripes, proud emblem of the glory of the Republic, should forever wave an inspiration to the youth of the land. Suppose here and there it should be a little more expensive in dollars and cents to own a building than it is to rent. Is it worth nothing to inspire patriotism and love of country in the hearts and minds of the youth of the country? No youth or citizen ever looked upon a Federal building in which the business of his country was being conducted but that he became a better American. Mr. Speaker, I remember quite well when I gazed for the first time upon this imposing building. It was just about 39 years ago, when I was a boy, not quite 17 years of age, and came to Washington for the first time. I had started from my home down in Georgia for the great Northwest, there to carve out my fortune. Although it was out of my way, I decided to come by Washington and see the wonderful city of which I had heard so much. I looked upon it as the seat of government of a foreign people, and somehow when I crossed the Potomac felt that I was on hostile soil. But, Mr. Speaker, when I came up Pennsylvania Avenue, and standing at the foot of the hill looking up at this magnificent structure, surmounting the dome of which stood a figure of the Goddess of Liberty; when I recalled the seven-years' struggle of the revolutionary patriots; the War of 1812; and the triumphant march of American soldiery across the sands of Mexico into the "Halls of the Montezumas," and remembered that the same blood which coursed through my veins had been shed in each of those three conflicts, I said, Thank God, this is my country, and Old Glory is my flag. [Applause.]

Breathes there a man with soul so dead
Who never to himself has said
This is my own, my native land?

[Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KITCHIN, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. GARLAND, for three days, on account of death in his family.

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 407) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 407, with Mr. Cox in the Chair.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The committee did not go into a long discussion of the merits of this bill, with the idea in view of taking it up under the five-minute rule so that it may be disposed of as expeditiously as possible under all the existing circumstances. I just want to say a word in regard to the general features of the bill. It is well known that we have had for many years our 160-acre home-

stead law and that it has been effective in the West, and permitted the valuable tracts of land to be taken up, so that a man could go upon a tract with his family and get a comfortable living for himself and those dependent upon him. Following that we had the 320-acre homestead law, which applied to a different character of land than that provided in the 640-acre homestead. That applied to land that was nontimbered, land that was not then known to be subject to irrigation. At the same time we reserved the minerals to the Government in the 320-acre homestead and do the same in this bill. That law has worked well, has permitted many hundreds of thousands of acres of the public land of the West to be filed upon, and it gave homes to our citizens, to the end that they have been able to maintain their families successfully and assist in building up the community in which the land is located and in the construction of schools and towns and good roads. Before passing this it must be recognized, and I am sure that many of the Members have forgotten it, that we had in force for many years what was known as the timber-culture law, which permitted a man to obtain 160 acres adjoining his homestead by planting trees upon it, to be added to the rest of his home, that he might use it for agricultural as well as grazing purposes.

In conjunction with the homestead of 160 acres we had during many years what was known as the preemption law, which permitted a man to file upon 160 acres and, living upon that land for six months and paying \$1.25 an acre for it, to obtain title to the land. It ought to be called to the attention of the committee, and I think I can safely say this, that with the exception of those who have gone there since the repeal of the preemption law, over half of the men in the West obtained a preemption claim and a homestead claim, which gave them 320 acres for their home. A number got the benefit of the timber-culture law. While few literally complied with the terms of it, it was afterwards amended to the extent that if they proved they cultivated a certain percentage of it they were permitted to make final proof. So that we find they were permitted to acquire a considerable quantity of land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, we now find large tracts of land provided for in the bill which are chiefly valuable for grazing and for the purposes of raising forage crops, and which do not contain much of the timber and are not susceptible to irrigation from any known source, and we believe that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family.

It is a fact that with a great deal of this land, of which there are millions of acres, that to plow it and destroy the native sod to a great extent ruins the value of the land for the farmer; and the purpose of the department, and that has been acted upon by the committee, is to give a man a sufficient quantity of land remaining which will permit him to go upon the land and live without cultivation, unless he can cultivate a small tract of 10 acres or 5 acres for the purpose of raising garden stuff and other things close at home, where he has a well or a spring, in order that he might raise stock, a few cattle, a few horses, and in some instances, in connection with cattle and horses, a few sheep. He will thereby become a permanent settler. He will add to the beef supply of the country, because it has been demonstrated by statistics which were thoroughly presented to the committee that in the settled communities and in the western public-land States there has been a large increase in cattle, in horses, and in many instances in sheep as the community settled and as the land became under private ownership, and that a better grade of cattle has been raised, for which the farmer received a better price. It is unquestionable and it is without doubt that the day of the great cattle king, horseman, and sheepman, so far as using the control of the great areas of the public domain is concerned, has passed.

Mr. McCracken. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. McCracken. Does the gentleman not think that he is now affording some opportunity to the stock owners, the big stock owners, to gather to themselves a large measure of the public domain by the passage of this act?

Mr. RAKER. No. In answer to that question I believe that the public-land States from the time of the 160-acre tracts to the 320-acre tracts and also the Kinkaid Act, which applied to western Nebraska, of 640 acres, the report will show that practically only 10 per cent—I believe it is less—of these homesteaders, of men living in that country, who own more than 640 acres, or

whose tracts have been disposed of, and from one or two millions the increase in productiveness and value has grown up to millions, and the department shows it is settled by good citizens, who live there, who have built up schools and churches and towns as well as they have in other parts of the United States, and that the large cattlemen have not been able to obtain the tracts that were possible to obtain at one time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much land can a homesteader now own under existing law?

Mr. RAKER. He can obtain 160 acres as homestead land and 160 acres of timber and stone land or 160 acres of desert land, or 320 acres of desert land. Except from the Kinkaid Act and the enlarged homestead law, a man to-day can only get 320 acres, when years before—I just want to enumerate—you permitted him to get a preemption tract of 160 acres; you permitted him to get a homestead of 160 acres; you permitted him to get a stone and timber claim of 160 acres; you permitted him to get a desert claim of 640 acres, and in some locations you permitted him to get 640 acres of desert claim besides the 640 acres under the general desert-land law. In addition to that, you permitted him to get a timber-culture entry.

Now, notwithstanding all these many entries and the large amount that was involved, and when all the best land had been obtained, we ask now simply that you recognize the homesteading people of the West and that a man may go there and receive a sufficiently large tract of land for him to make a home upon and from which he may support himself and family.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may have five minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the settler has acquired 640 acres, is he now at his maximum which he can acquire?

Mr. RAKER. It is 320 acres now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the maximum amount now that he can obtain—640 acres?

Mr. RAKER. No; 320 acres.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If he had 320 acres now, under the gentleman's bill can he obtain more?

Mr. RAKER. He can obtain 320 acres more, making 640 acres, provided the 320 acres he acquires is of the same class and character as that designated in this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did not we have a bill passed in the last session that provided for a 640-acre tract?

Mr. RAKER. This is the same bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is this the same bill?

Mr. RAKER. Yes. If a man acquires, under subdivision 2, 640 acres, his right is exhausted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What does this paragraph 9 bestow upon a man who has 640 acres; the right to purchase?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; the right to purchase where he has less than 640 acres.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not where he has 640 acres?

Mr. RAKER. No. In other words, if a man has 160 acres, and there is a tract of land adjoining him of this character, he may buy enough of it to make 640 acres. No; he can only buy 320 acres of this kind of land, and add to what he already has.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If this bill passes, a man could not acquire a maximum of more than 640 acres?

Mr. RAKER. Not at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Under existing law and this additional law?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And this pertains only to arid or semiarid lands?

Mr. RAKER. That is all.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Under this, is one who takes up 640 acres required to live upon it?

Mr. RAKER. He is; he can not commute it, the same as a 160-acre homestead; but the only thing he does not have to do is he does not have to cultivate it, because much of this land ought not to be cultivated; but he must put in \$1.25 of improvements to the acre.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. What kind of improvements?

Mr. RAKER. Fences, houses, wells, barns, and things that are permanent for the purpose of developing and adding to his home.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In building a fence around 640 acres, is that accepted as doing all that is necessary?

Mr. RAKER. If he adds the value of \$1.25 an acre, because that brings it to the very highest state of use and—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. But would not that lead to the very thing the gentleman spoke of first—

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Now, wait a moment—of acquiring this land for the purpose of disposing of it to the very large owners of land there and stock raisers?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And ultimately result in getting it into one big block of great areas of land under this law?

Mr. RAKER. From my observation and experience up to date, and the information which we get that has been presented by the department, and particularly under the Kinkaid 640-acre Act, from actual experience of 30 years I would say no; that these men would take them for homes, for the purpose of using it and occupying it and build up and become part of the community in which the land was situated.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would the gentleman in charge of the bill consent to an amendment that improvements to the value of \$1.25 an acre, exclusive of fences, should be required?

Mr. RAKER. Well, I think no; for this reason: Now, gentlemen know that this is for the purpose of a stock-raising homestead. Gentlemen, the use of the land, the value of the land, is the fact that a man by dint of hard work and skimping in the things he needs and his wife needs, so that he may be able to get enough money to put up a good, substantial fence under the State law around this 640 acres, so that he, and he alone, may get the benefit of it and add to the value of his holdings—

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma to answer the question, too.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCracken] have both raised a question that ought to be raised here and ought to be debated and looked into, and that is, Will the granting of a large unit to anybody result in it getting into the hands of a few people?

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. I merely wanted, if the gentleman will yield—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized in my own right.

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. I merely wanted to state in connection with that that the State I have the honor to represent in part has perhaps more public lands by a good deal than any State in the Union. In fact, we have one-fifth of the unappropriated public land in the United States, something over 50,000,000 acres. Now, I think there is nothing that the large cattle owner and sheep owner would get from this bill to the detriment of any citizen of this country, and nothing they want to get, for this reason: That they have absolute right now to run their herds over the public domain, and they can get it cheaper than they could by buying somebody's homestead right. I merely state that as a reason. Why should it be to their benefit to buy something when they do not have to pay anything at all now? The cattlemen and sheepmen do not favor this bill.

Mr. FERRIS. I thank the gentleman. The Department of the Interior had in contemplation the passage of this bill this year because it passed the House last year. I reintroduced it again this year on the first day of the session.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was that bill called a bill to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes?

Mr. FERRIS. The bill is the same as last year. We did not cross a "t" or dot an "i."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The title is the same?

Mr. FERRIS. That is my recollection. I dropped it in the basket just as it passed the House last year.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I should like to inquire whether there is any provision in this bill for the granting of these homesteads to anyone under 21 years of age?

Mr. FERRIS. No; there is not. I think there is a separate bill pending, introduced by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], to grant homesteads to boys and girls of 18 years of age or over. That is not dealt with in this bill at all. As to the question raised by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCracken], as I said, the bill passed the House last year, and the Department of the Interior knew it was going to be introduced and pressed

again this year. So they made an investigation by sending men out to western Nebraska to determine what had been done under the only 640-acre law that had ever been passed, the Kinkaid Act. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] is still a Member of the House, and an honored one, and is entitled to great credit for having blazed the way for this 640-acre legislation. He got this legislation as applying to 37 counties in the sand hills of western Nebraska. At that time they could not get anybody to live there except cattlemen and sheepmen. They argued that if we passed a law giving them 640 acres of land, in a few years a few men would own it all and drive the cattle all out of the country. Now, as I have said, the Department of the Interior sent special agents out to investigate that very thing, first to ascertain if they would buy it all up, and if it really worked that way; and, second, if it really did drive the cattle out of the country.

Now, here is what they say on the subject of large holdings:

Of the land entered in Nebraska under the section law there is an average of one settler for every 571 acres.

Now, that is less than the unit originally granted.

In the 37 counties affected by this law it appears that there are 4,589,870 acres in the hands of the original entrymen, 6,411,963 acres in the hands of small holders—

These cases, I assume, are where the first entryman started out and sold to a second man who had a little more money and was able to stick a little tighter and remain a little longer, because it is still in the hands of the small owner. They say further:

And only 316,453 acres in the hands of what might be termed large holders; that is, those possessing areas in excess of 2,000 acres.

Now, the Kinkaid Act, passed 11 years ago, in 1904—pretty nearly 12 years ago—and you can see that a very small amount has crept into the hands of big holders, and you can see what a large amount has remained in the original entryman's hands, and you can see there is a family in that community for every 571 acres, which is less than the present size of unit. They say further:

The department is informed that the practically unanimous sentiment of the people in western Nebraska is that the law has been a benefit to them and to the country, causing a large increase in the population, promoting the development of the lands, and advancing generally the public welfare.

Let me go back and show you the figures as to whether or not it actually drives cattle out of the country. I have no doubt the Members of the House feel that because we pass a large unit, that runs the cattlemen out. Not at all. The small farmer has more cattle and produces more cattle on a given area than they do where the range is not protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed further. I will not burn up much more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. The big objection to this legislation always is that it drives the cattlemen out of business and drives the sheepmen out of business and all that kind of argument. Let me give you the facts. The Kinkaid Act passed in 1904. The value of the cattle in 1904, when the Kinkaid Act was passed, was \$3,176,100. Let us get this, because here is a point the committee ought to know:

In 1914—

That was last summer a year ago, when this investigation was made—

\$4,267,055; increase, 34 per cent.

Now, listen to the rest of this showing:

In 1904—

That was the year when the Kinkaid Act was passed—
30 counties produced 69,962 bushels of potatoes; in 1914, 2,671,924 bushels; increase, 3,719 per cent.

Now, gentlemen, in raising the unit a little—

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. I want to know from the gentleman if the figures there give an increase in the number of head of cattle? The gentleman gave the value.

Mr. FERRIS. I believe it does. I will see if I can turn to it. I did not report this bill and have not given much attention to it. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] reported the bill. I think it does give the number of head.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FERRIS. I do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is familiar with the public-land laws. I would like to call his attention to section 10 of the bill, which provides—

That all entries made and patents issued under the provisions of this act shall be subject to and contain a reservation to the United States of all the coal and other minerals in the lands so entered and patented—

And so forth.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would that cover the Government's interest in oil lands?

Mr. FERRIS. It would. We believe it would cover every kind of mineral. All kinds of minerals are reserved; and, more than that, it does not apply to timberlands or to lands susceptible of irrigation or any land that can get water from any known source. It merely gives the settler who is possessed of any pluck an opportunity to go out and take 640 acres and make a home there. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and I rode over it last summer, and if a man can stick on that land and convert it into a prosperous community, as was done under the Kinkaid Act, I say, "God speed him on."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If any oil should be discovered on these lands later on, the Government's right to that oil would be preserved under this mineral clause, would it?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; and further, this act authorizes the re-entry upon these lands to extract oil and coal and anything else in the way of minerals that may be on it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not think it is necessary to specify oil?

Mr. FERRIS. No. That is a mineral. But I have no objection to it being mentioned specifically if it is at all thought necessary. I feel doubly sure, however, it is not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has been called to my attention that the word "mineral" would not include oil.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think it is necessary; but if the gentleman thinks there is any conceivable doubt about it we will put it in, because not a single gentleman from the West who has been urging this legislation wants anybody to be allowed to homestead mineral land. This does not apply to a single acre of land in my own State, and therefore I have no selfish interest in it. But these gentlemen who are interested in it do not want to homestead mineral land or ordinary homestead land or oil land.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There is a provision here that permits a man who has taken up and homesteaded one of these tracts, and wants to give it up and take up 640 acres under this law, to do that?

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In case he does that and takes up 640 acres, is he required to live on it?

Mr. FERRIS. He is; and he is required to comply with every other requirement of this bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I did not understand that it was necessary for him to live on it at all.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me give the gentleman a practical example. Suppose under the existing law the gentleman from Michigan and myself resided in Colorado. Suppose we had made a 320-acre homestead of arid land, or 160 acres, which is as much as we can get, of better land. Suppose the gentleman and myself were just in the act of failing to stay there by reason of the smallness of our holdings. This bill says we can relinquish our holdings and turn them back to the Government and start over anew.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. I would call the gentleman's attention to section 9, on page 7. That answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. FERRIS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, I am not presumptuous enough to estimate that my humble vouching for the successful operation of the Nebraska act will add anything to the ex cathedra

report of the honorable Secretary of the Interior in reporting on the provisions of the pending bill, inasmuch as the report gives such a hearty and unqualified indorsement of the Nebraska act, of which I was the author.

Right here, Mr. Chairman, I must thank the Members who have given such generous indorsement of the virtues of the Nebraska act, incidentally complimenting the Nebraska Member, its author. I will at once admit the act to be fully deserving of the indorsement given it by the membership of this House, but I shall not admit myself to be fully entitled to the complimentary expressions bestowed upon me. However, I am very grateful both for justice done the act and the consideration given me by the Members of the House. I wish to again thank the Members who helped to pass the act in this House February, 1904. I wish also to thank, on this floor, the honorable Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and their able and painstaking assistants, both in the departments here in Washington and in the field service, for the careful, fair, painstaking, and thorough investigation made and report of the operation of the Nebraska act. This official finding, from which later I shall briefly quote, justly closes the question whether the act of April 28, 1904, was in the interest of the public welfare.

Mr. Chairman, it was a burning question in western Nebraska when I was first nominated for the House what was to be done with the public-land question. On the one hand, was it to be a leasing bill whereby the lands would remain public domain and nontaxable in the hands and under control of large ranchmen lessees indefinitely, or, on the other hand, should it be an enlarged homestead act whereby the many would be afforded an opportunity to acquire homes. I did not hesitate to choose the latter alternative, and I introduced a bill for a 640-acre homestead. It was regarded as rather a novelty here, and precedents were demanded. My answer was that we had better make a precedent, and that this case would be an experiment.

Very strong opposition did exist in my district to the bill, and this very naturally by those who had so long enjoyed the benefits of free range for their herds. Had it been deemed likely that the bill would receive favorable consideration by the Congress, I feel confident that opposition would have become organized and determined in an effort to defeat it. But no opposition came up from western Nebraska or other localities in the grazing West to protest to the Congress against the measure, and the bill became law.

Paradoxically as it would now seem in the light of the report of the present able Secretary of the Interior, the then honorable Secretary of the Interior refused the bill his sanction on the ground that the bill was being sought in the interests of the large ranchmen, who were, in fact, generally opposed to it. While the law was applauded by the mass of the people, its enactment evoked for a time strong opposition among large ranchmen both in Nebraska and in other parts of the grazing West to which it was feared its provisions might be extended.

Mr. Chairman, it is very gratifying to me to be warranted in stating the fact that practically all opposition in Nebraska which at first arose to the Nebraska act has gradually turned to hearty approval.

But while the operation of the act continued to gain for it popularity at home, organized influences outside of Nebraska, by newspaper and magazine publications, tried hard to write it down. In fact, it was only a year ago when delegates coming from the far West appeared before the Public Lands Committee of the House and charged that the operation of the Nebraska act had been a failure. But they were seeking the passage of a leasing bill in opposition to a homestead bill like the one now pending.

Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that uncalled-for assaults made upon the measure by opposition organized in States west of Nebraska at times have caused me some annoyance, but I never deemed them of sufficient importance to require refutation on the floor of this House, but by analogy I found justification as well as consolation in the rule of evidence that the reputation of an individual is legitimately determined by what the people in his own vicinity may think of him, knowing full well that the Nebraska act was constantly being vindicated by the people in the territory included in its provisions.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of the change from a 160-acre to a 640-acre unit for a homestead in Nebraska soon wrought a great transformation. For a few years preceding its enactment the population in the territory covered by the act had actually been decreasing, contrary to the ordinary rule in a new and undeveloped country. The effect was to change this order to a rapidly increasing population. Hitherto in the small towns the lumberyards and the hotels had been abandoned. Now these businesses were restored and made prosperous, and all other

branches of business were likewise favorably affected by the change. New paint was applied to the neglected buildings of these partially depopulated towns and a new atmosphere of activity, upgrowth, and prosperity was realized.

In keeping with the increase of population the number of school districts and schoolhouses was increased. The high standard of the Nebraska common school, second to that of no State in the Union, became extended more and more to the newly formed settlements. In passing it is proper to state all that is necessary to be done in Nebraska to secure funds for a good school is to perform the condition precedent of securing a sufficient number of children of school age to patronize it and profit by it, for a large school fund is permanently provided for. This insures the best quality of instruction, generally by young women in the country districts, graduates of high schools, State normal schools, and many of them graduates of our own Nebraska State University or other Nebraska universities, of which we are proud, as well as such educational institutions in other States.

Mr. Chairman, and the Sunday-school missionaries have also contributed bountifully to the general uplift. They have promoted so much for the good of these new communities that I find myself too much limited in time to accord them due credit. Let it suffice to say there has been employed to work with the new population of children a number of men—talented, most enterprising, faithful, energetic, up-to-date, and most efficient Sunday-school missionaries I have every known anywhere. Thus in the area in question creditable school buildings and churches in due proportion to the area partially reflect the rapid progress of the inhabitants. But I should add the pulpits are here filled as ably as anywhere in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, my time being too limited to longer dilate on the favorable change produced by the operation of the act, I shall here read from the report of the honorable Secretary of the Interior, made December 15, 1915, on the pending bill, to the House Committee on the Public Lands, beginning with the last paragraph on page 3 thereof and reading to the commencement of the last paragraph on page 4.

It reads:

Since the last session of Congress the department has been seeking information as to the advisability of the passage of such a law as is now proposed by this bill. Attention has been especially directed to the operation of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat., 547), which authorized the entry of not exceeding 640 acres of land in a considerable area of western Nebraska. The provisions of that act, as applying to that limited area, were in the main designed to meet the same conditions which the present bill proposes to meet as to other areas of the public lands. Eleven years have elapsed since the passage of the law relating to western Nebraska, and the investigations of the department as to the results of that legislation are both important and significant. Prior to the passage of the act of 1904 considerable land in western Nebraska had been entered under other laws, but the marvelous development since the passage of the act of 1904 is so marked that it must in great measure at least be attributed to that law. It has been found that some of the valleys and lower lands which intersperse the larger area have been made to produce through intensive cultivation varied crops of large value, and that the production of live stock has largely increased rather than diminished. The improvements placed by the settlers upon their claims indicate both prosperity and permanency of occupation, as dwellings of stone, cement, or frame construction, plastered and provided with conveniences, have generally supplanted the original sod houses, and the farmer who has not built barns, silos, or other structures for storing crops and protecting live stock is a rare exception. The live stock raised upon the small ranches is of a higher grade than that which was produced by grazing upon the vacant public lands.

It appears from statistics collected, covering 31 counties within the area to which said law is applicable, that the population was 124,508 in 1890, 107,434 in 1900, and 162,217 in 1910, an increase of nearly 50 per cent in population during said 10-year period, during 6 years of which the 640-acre homestead law was in force.

The value of household furniture increased from \$174,779 in 1904 to \$342,312 in 1914, an increase of 95 per cent.

The value of agricultural implements in 1904 was \$139,609; in 1914, \$243,304; increase, 74 per cent.

The value of cattle in 1904 was \$3,176,100; in 1914, \$4,267,055; increase, 34 per cent.

In 1904, 30 counties produced 69,962 bushels of potatoes; in 1914, 2,671,924 bushels; increase, 3,719 per cent.

Number of acres planted to rye in 27 counties in 1904, 47,451; in 1914, 91,336; increase, 92 per cent.

Number of acres planted to oats in 28 counties in 1904, 47,451; in 1914, 91,336; increase, 92 per cent.

Number of acres planted to corn in 28 counties in 1904, 564,554; in 1914, 1,143,916; increase, 102 per cent.

Number of acres planted to wheat in 27 counties in 1904, 122,799; in 1914, 297,900; increase, 142 per cent.

Number of horses in 31 counties in 1892, 107,295; in 1904, 168,556; increase, 57 per cent; in 1914, 282,624; increase, 67 per cent.

Number of hogs in 29 counties in 1904, 171,849; in 1914, 225,480; increase, 31 per cent.

The acreage of improved land in 27 counties increased 68 per cent in 12 years, 1892 to 1904; increased 77 per cent in 10 years, 1904 to 1914. The value of the improved land decreased 18 per cent the first period and increased 143 per cent the second.

The total assessed valuation of all property in 31 counties in 1892 was \$23,468,899.69; in 1904, \$27,480,836.57; increase, 17 per cent; in 1914, \$57,278,766; increase, 108 per cent.

Of the land entered in Nebraska under the section law there is an average of one settler for every 571 acres. In the 37 counties affected by this law, it appears that there are 4,589,870 acres in the hands of

the original entrymen, 6,411,963 acres in the hands of small holders, and only 316,453 acres in the hands of what might be termed large holders; that is, those possessing areas in excess of 2,000 acres. The department is informed that the practically unanimous sentiment of the people in western Nebraska is that the law has been a benefit to them and to the country, causing a large increase in the population, promoting the development of the lands, and advancing generally the public welfare.

Mr. Chairman, there are few unacquainted with the territory covered by the act who can adequately conceive of the splendid picture—which is a reality—which this report presents; it shows plainly that an abundant harvest is being reaped from the operation of the law our Congress was wise enough to pass nearly 12 years ago. Is not 12 years a sufficient test and when successful a sufficient vindication of the merits of a law?

Mr. Chairman, no other public-land law has ever attained greater popularity than the Nebraska act is accorded by the people in the community where the lands lie.

Mr. Chairman, as I told my constituents at the time, the reason for providing for an enlarged homestead instead of for a leasing law was based upon the rule of legislation, "the greatest good to the greatest number," and this has abundantly proven to be the character of the act in this case.

Mr. Chairman, the pending Ferris bill fundamentally is the same as the Nebraska act, and its purpose is the same. And I am confident that if duly enacted into a law its operation will prove beneficent and inure to the great good of the people generally and to the States wherever the act may be applied. I am therefore most heartily in favor of the Ferris bill. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that at the close of the gentleman's remarks debate on this paragraph may close.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no; there are several gentlemen over here who wish to discuss it.

Mr. MANN. We would like to have 25 minutes on this side.

Mr. FERRIS. Then I think we can get along faster by not asking for any limitation.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that he make his request.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of 35 minutes the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. MANN. Of which I am to have control of 25 minutes?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of 35 minutes debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. FERRIS. Twenty-five minutes to be yielded to the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri, and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in listening to the explanation of the gentleman on the committee who reported this bill as to its effect on the stock-raising industry of the West. If the bill has the effect of increasing the production of live stock in the West, as the gentleman anticipates, it will not only be of great benefit to the public-land States but to the entire country. Everyone familiar with the live-stock industry in this country has noted with alarm that in the last decade the supply of live stock has steadily decreased as the population and consuming power of the American people have increased. The explanation of that is very simple. As the land in the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys and in the older sections of our country becomes more thickly settled it becomes increasingly difficult for the farmer to raise the young stock necessary to keep up the supply. If he had an ample supply of stockers and feeders he could employ them profitably on his blue grass, with his corn, and fatten them for the market; but the difficulty has been in raising the supply of stockers and feeders; and frequently it is to be noticed that in the great live-stock markets of Kansas City, Omaha, St. Louis, and Chicago the stockers and feeders bring a price almost as high as that brought by cattle on the market.

I take it, this land will not be confined to raising stockers and feeders, because in the great alfalfa belt, in which the land is located, a large amount of the cattle—or a fair percentage of them—will be fattened for actual slaughter; but, as I understand, this will provide an increasing area for the raising of young stock, for stockers and feeders, for the more thickly settled portions of the country, and to my mind that is the solution of the American cattle business. We have ample blue grass in the Missouri Valley, ample pasturage and water, and ample corn.

If the Department of Agriculture adopts standard grades of corn to be shipped in interstate commerce, there will be a certain amount of corn that must be fed on the farm and that can not be shipped profitably. Therefore the farmer must have some stock to eat the corn and other feed which remains on his farm.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. I have not a great deal of time.

Mr. RAKER. In confirmation of what the gentleman has stated I want to read one sentence, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. This comes from Montana:

I believe that the enactment of the law providing for 640-acre homesteads will result in the production of a greater number of cattle than were found on those ranges during the most prosperous days of the cattle range.

Mr. BORLAND. I hope that will prove true. In the old days, when I was a boy in the live-stock business, we had an open range covering all the territory of the gentleman from Oklahoma and large parts of other States. To-day most of that range is either in private ownership or in forest reserves or otherwise withdrawn. The live-stock business has suffered in consequence, and we are going to Argentina and elsewhere to find beef for slaughtering in this country. In fact, some of our American packing houses are now located in the South American countries. If this bill does have a tendency to increase the live-stock production of this country, it will be a valuable thing for every section of the country, including the great consuming centers of the East.

In addition to that not only is the cattle industry affected but the sheep industry. In our section of the country sheep are used by the farmers principally to clear up pasturage and brushwood and stuff of that kind. It is difficult for our farmers to get sheep; sheep are selling high in Missouri to-day under the blessings of Providence and a Democratic administration. The farmers can not pick up bunches of sheep, as they would like to, for the purpose of clearing up old pastures and clearing up old woodland; but here is another outlet for enterprise and industry for our friends on the public-land States. They can raise sheep for the Mississippi and Missouri Valleys, and every bunch of young sheep would be readily taken up by the farmers in my section. I am glad to support the bill that will not only produce more population for the Western States but will tend to increase the live-stock industry in the whole country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have procured this time simply to ask permission to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a brief extract from an address by Prof. Charles H. Herty, of North Carolina, to the American Chemical Society, of which he is president.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing an address of Prof. Charles H. Herty. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, on page 1, line 4, the word "qualified" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "entitled."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the word "qualified" and insert in lieu thereof the word "entitled."

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, according to my reading of this section, the language is ambiguous as to whether the present phraseology would not grant to those who have already exercised the privilege of homestead an additional right to take 640 acres under this bill. I have read the section of the Revised Statutes applicable that gives the right to a homestead entry, and certainly there is nothing there that would forbid the person from exercising again the right under this law if he has heretofore exercised it. The word "entitled" clears that ambiguity, and certainly it was not the intention of the committee to grant to those who have already exercised the right an additional homestead.

Mr. FERRIS. That is right.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am in sympathy with the purpose of trying to increase the acreage for stock-raising purposes. There is no question but that the supporters of this bill will attain great popularity in those States where these lands are situated. We know the rare popularity and deserved popularity of the gentleman from Nebraska who gave to his people the addi-

tional privilege of locating on some 480 acres. Of course, every farmer in the western country who has already taken a homestead entry of 160 acres will be most thankful for the additional grant of 480 acres. That goes without saying.

But, Mr. Chairman, it can not escape my thought that some of these lands will fall into the hands of large stock raisers because there is no condition of tenure whatever placed upon those who take the additional amount and commute; as soon as he pays the \$1.25 an acre he may, as soon as he gets the patent, sell to some large stock-raising concerns of whom we know so much by reputation, who have preempted the lands in great stock-raising estates in Montana and other Western States.

All through the bill runs the idea that you want to give additional land to the local person. As I view the question of the vacant public lands, I favor their retention for the benefit of those who have not to-day any public land. We all know that there are thousands living in the Middle West who wish to find some little spot where they may have land enough to call home. But this bill I hardly think will result in getting those people to go into the far West. It is said that the available public lands are of poor quality. I must confess that I do not know. And yet I have inquiries from constituents as to lands available to take up a home. If it were not for the fact that I believe that much of this land is suitable for a homestead under the present 320-acre law, I would be more inclined to support this bill very strongly. Every session bills are coming in here conferring additional grants to those who have already entered a homestead, and thereby taking away the land from those who are entitled by right to preempt it—those living in distant parts of the country, who have not availed themselves of that right. With the remaining public land, our policy should be to retain it for the benefit of those without a home, and there are many thousands who wish to locate on the public land, even though the best has already been taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONDELL) there were—ayes 14, noes 16.

So the amendment was lost.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], now that his amendment is defeated, that under the decisions of the Interior Department for the last two or three years, decisions rendered time after time, no one who has made and perfected a homestead entry for any area, even as small as 40 acres, would be allowed to take a homestead under this language.

Mr. STAFFORD. But this is a new law.

Mr. MONDELL. The decisions that have been rendered are under the 320-acre enlarged homestead law containing identical language.

Mr. STAFFORD. Those decisions are not written into this law.

Mr. MONDELL. Unless the department changes its decisions there would be no question about it, and the word the gentleman proposes is one that never has been passed upon, and no one can know what it would be interpreted to mean, whereas the term used is one that has been used in the law for years.

Mr. STAFFORD. The word I did suggest is one with a clear meaning, whereas the language here has not a clear meaning.

Mr. MONDELL. The word "qualified" has been passed upon frequently since we had homestead laws. At one time under the decision of the Interior Department the words "qualified entryman" were held to embrace all otherwise qualified who had not perfected entry to a full 160 acres, but several years ago they were held to include only those who had never perfected an entry.

As to the suggestion of our friend from Wisconsin that we are proposing to open up a lot of land to homestead entries for the benefit of those in the States where the lands lie rather than for those who may come from other States, it is true that there are some sections of this bill which would give benefits to those already on the ground, but the general provisions of the bill will be utilized in nine cases out of ten by people who come from other States rather than the States in which the lands are located. Under the enlarged-homestead bill which we passed several years ago, and which has been very useful, I am of opinion that nine out of ten of the entries made in my State were made by men from States east of the Missouri River, certainly by those not residents of what are known commonly as the public-land States.

Mr. Chairman, it is about 30 years ago that Maj. Powell, then at the head of the Geological Survey, suggested what he thought should be the orderly evolution of the homestead theory. He

suggested that in the course of time we would pass from the 160-acre homestead to a larger homestead, as the lands to be taken were poorer in character—less productive—and that finally we would pass to a homestead of 640 or 1,280 acres, or even larger, for the very poor and desert lands of the country.

The first day of the last Congress I introduced what I think was the first general grazing-homestead bill introduced in the House, providing for a homestead of from 640 to 1,280 acres. I am of opinion that it would have been better to have this latitude as to area in a homestead bill of this character rather than confine the entries to 640 acres or less. The Secretary of the Interior, in discussing the matter, suggested the thought that it would be at this time difficult for them to make such an examination of the public lands as would enable them to intelligently judge as to what lands might be properly entered in 640-acre areas, and what lands might be properly entered in larger areas, expressing the opinion held by all who are familiar with the situation, however, that as to some of our lands we will probably go to a still larger homestead entry some time in the future. We passed the enlarged homestead bill, which I had the honor to introduce and report to the House as the first step in the evolution from the 160-acre homestead. In passing that bill we adhered to the farm-homestead idea, to the idea that the homesteader should be a farmer, and our thought was to make it possible to farm on the semiarid lands where farming is carried on under what are known as dry-farming methods. Under that law requiring specific and definite areas of cultivation, and the first homestead law to so require, we have settled very large areas in the West which otherwise would be and which, up to the time of their settlement, were retained in the possession of the great flocks and herds run under grange conditions. I said that was the first step in the evolution. I had forgotten for the time being the step taken some years ago which has been referred to here, applying the grazing-homestead idea to western Nebraska.

We had, as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] has stated, a considerable discussion, and there was in Nebraska and elsewhere a long controversy as to what we should do. It was finally determined to try the grazing-homestead idea in western Nebraska. We were able to pass a law and to apply it to a certain definite territory, because in that particular territory there was neither timber nor mineral, and very little land left that was fit for cultivation. It was an area where the remaining public lands were practically all of them available or useful for grazing purposes only, and incidentally for a certain class of tillage for forage crops. The law has worked splendidly, even better than we hoped it would at the time we passed it. Some have suggested that under this 640-acre law, generally applied under the terms of this bill, there may be and there is danger of the gradual bringing together of these areas in very large ownerships. I think there is little danger of that in a harmful way. It is true that as you reach the lands that have a very small productive capacity—and undoubtedly some lands of that character will be taken under this law—there will be a tendency to the consolidation of those entries, and it is possible that in some localities where this law is utilized we shall finally reach a situation where instead of the economic conditions bringing about an average ownership of about 500 acres, as in western Nebraska, we may have an average ownership of considerable more and ownerships in some instances of as high as several thousand acres, but in my opinion as that tendency toward large areas in single ownerships will not go on to any great extent on lands that have any considerable productive capacity. It is common experience that the small stockman can in many cases make better use of these lands than the large stockman. Therefore the tendency is not toward very large areas, but to the reasonable areas used as a home, cared for in such a way as to produce the very largest return. There will, of course, be some localities where the best economy will be found in the consolidation of considerable areas in a single ownership or control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCracken].

Mr. McCracken. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the purpose of this bill. As the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] stated awhile ago, the purpose of this bill is to increase the number of live stock in this country, but I doubt very much if it will serve that purpose in my State. I am inclined to think it will have the opposite effect in many localities, for it will afford an opportunity to some entrymen to make an entry of large tracts of land without any intention of cultivating or improving it, but who merely intend to obstruct the free use of the open range by stockmen. I have known some instances

where men have made homestead entries on lands that were adapted for no other purpose than grazing and who would take the first opportunity to exact tribute from the first flockmasters who came along before he would permit stock to be driven over his land to the summer ranges. Even under the enlarged-homestead act entrymen have been known to deliberately enter lands with but one purpose in view, and that was to fix an arbitrary price for the little grazing privilege which his entry might afford. I do not intend to convey the idea that the enlarged-homestead act has not helped our State, for the fact is that thousands of entrymen have in good faith availed themselves of the privilege which that act affords, and they have increased the wheat yield in Idaho enormously. The little town of American Falls, in the southeastern part of Idaho, has become the second largest primary wheat-shipping point in the world. Rexburg, another town in southeastern Idaho, ranks close this year to American Falls as a wheat-shipping point. For miles around these two towns the farmers are successfully engaged in dry farming, and the larger number of them have made their entries under the enlarged-homestead act. If these people could be served by this act, I should be much in favor of it, but I do not see how it can be of advantage to any large number of people in the arid portion of the State of Idaho; but I can see where the act can be employed to harass and annoy both large and small live-stock owners who are trying to carry on their business in a legitimate way.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCracken. I will.

Mr. NORTON. Why can not these men do the same kind of thing under the 320-acre enlarged-homestead act?

Mr. McCracken. It has been done in some localities.

Mr. NORTON. This will not change conditions, then?

Mr. McCracken. I think the act now proposed will give a larger advantage to the man who does not make his entry in good faith; I am sure it will.

Mr. GANDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCracken. Yes.

Mr. GANDY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that a 320-acre entry was sufficient for his State; that a man can make a living on that land?

Mr. McCracken. Yes; I believe that in most cases 320 acres of land suitable for agricultural purposes will afford the entryman an opportunity to make a living.

Mr. GANDY. If that is true, this will not hurt you a bit, because the 320-acre entry will continue, and a man will only take up those tracts of land where he must necessarily have 640 acres on which to support a family.

Mr. McCracken. The bill proposes to allow the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether or not a given tract of land is sufficient to support a family. I doubt if there is anyone in the office of the Secretary who will be able to promulgate rules and regulations which will make this bill operative and which will distinguish the bona fide entrymen from the man who desires to acquire large tracts of the public domain in order that he might get control of a vast area of grazing land.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCracken. I will.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. How many sheep are there in the State of Idaho?

Mr. McCracken. I am unable to give the gentleman the number as shown by the assessment rolls of 1915, but I am informed that the value of the flocks in Idaho represent nearly \$15,000,000.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. In my State they represent as much as 50 per cent of the money taken in, and we have the same trouble there. I am a sheep and cattle man both.

Mr. McCracken. I want to say this, gentlemen, that I have been told by small owners of sheep and other live stock that if this bill becomes a law it will in large part destroy the live-stock industry in my State. Now, I do not think you want to do that, and certainly I do not want to do it. I am not the owner of any kind of live stock, but I want to plead for that which I think is for the best interest of the honest stock owner, who is obliged by the very nature of his business to range his stock upon the public domain during the grazing season.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCracken. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the Record certain portions of an address delivered by the president of the Wool Growers' Association which relate to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCracken. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this discussion, I will say that at a recent meeting of the Wool Growers' Association, which was held last December in Boise City, the president of that organization, in his annual address, spoke in part as follows:

The range situation is steadily growing worse from the viewpoint of the woolgrower. Every plan for the disposal of the public lands is an increased area for the settler, whether he can make use of the same or not; a grazing homestead of 640 acres is now the proposal advanced by Congress. This bill passed the House of Representatives during the last session, but failed in the Senate by reason of the adjournment of that body. There is no question but that such a bill will be again introduced. Should it pass, it will mean the end of the range business as we now know it. With the 2-mile limit law in the statute books, the priority-rights case decided against our industry, and the privilege of entering on 640 acres of land extended to all and sundry without any residence requirements or any proof to show they can put such an area to beneficial use, we can readily see our finish.

But this is essentially a grazing country, and such land will eventually revert to be used for grazing purposes, but it will be in the hands of large corporations, who, owning the land, will enjoy privileges undreamed of by the woolgrower of to-day.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS].

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the purpose of this bill, but I do not believe it will have the tendency to increase cattle raising in this country. On the contrary, I think the tendency would be to restrict the raising of cattle. I am thoroughly familiar with the territory comprised in the Kinkaid Act, and I know of my own knowledge that previous to the enactment of that act many more cattle were raised upon the territory comprehended therein than have been raised since.

I notice in the report of the Secretary of the Interior, which is before this body, that in stating the increase in cattle he places it in value instead of number.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. REAVIS. I do.

Mr. RAKER. Has the gentleman looked over the statistics in regard to the increase in the number of cattle in Nebraska and in the Western States for the last 10 years as population advanced and as the land has been built up?

Mr. REAVIS. I have not; but I take it for granted, from observation, that the production of cattle upon the range in the West, and especially in western Nebraska, is less to-day than it was 10 years ago.

I argue from the report of the Secretary of the Interior which accompanies this bill, that when he states the increase in volume of the potatoes produced, the increase in acreage of rye, oats, corn, and wheat, on the territory comprehended in the Kinkaid bill, when he further states the increase in the number of horses and the number of hogs, and states only the increase in the value of cattle without stating whether there was an increase in number, that there has been a reduction in the number of cattle, otherwise his report would not have been restricted to value alone. It has been the observation of every man within the sound of my voice that live stock, cattle especially, to-day and in 1914 are worth approximately double what they were in 1904, and the increase in value of the cattle upon the territory comprehended in the Kinkaid Act, from \$3,176,000 in 1904 to \$4,287,000 in 1914, would argue a decrease in the number of cattle rather than an increase. When this vast territory is divided up into farms of a section each it is no longer devoted exclusively to the raising of cattle as it is when the whole range is open to the great cattle firms. This is shown—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. REAVIS. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Would it have been possible for the Secretary of the Interior to have told anything about cattle from the taxation books of those counties? What proportion of those cattle that ranged that country at the time you speak of would have shown on the tax rolls of the counties which they range?

Mr. REAVIS. I have no means of knowing, Mr. Chairman, but he had sufficient information to enable him to show the number of horses that ranged on that territory, and the value of the cattle within its limits.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not better to raise one steer that is worth \$100 than to raise three long-horned Texas cattle worth only \$33.50 each?

Mr. REAVIS. The steer that you raise to-day was worth only \$33.25 in 1904. But the reason for the decrease in the number of cattle is that the section taken up by the individual farmer is no longer devoted entirely to cattle raising. In the territory comprehended in the Kinkaid Act I find from 1904 to 1914 the increase in the production of potatoes in that territory was 3,719 per cent.

The increase in the acreage of rye was 92 per cent. The increase in the acreage of oats was 80 per cent, and I might follow the list on down. And the reason, Mr. Chairman, that the cattle produced in that territory, divided as this bill provides, are less in number than formerly, is that the acreage no longer is devoted exclusively to cattle raising, but is now devoted in part to the raising of grain. And yet I favor this bill, because I believe any bill that will offer a home to satisfy the land hunger of the homeless, that will permit individuals to make homes as they have made them in the district of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID], is a good bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Would the gentleman like one or two minutes more?

Mr. REAVIS. I would.

Mr. FERRIS. I yield to the gentleman a couple of minutes.

Mr. REAVIS. I can remember the day, 15 years ago, when I traveled over the territory that was comprehended by the Kinkaid bill, and it was as bleak and as barren a waste as one would ever expect to see in this Nation of ours. You may go to that same locality to-day—opened up to settlement by an act that granted to the settler a section of land; that granted to him sufficient territory to support his family, to rear his children in comparative comfort—and you will see a schoolhouse on nearly every hillside and a church in approximately every valley.

The only reason, Mr. Chairman, that they were constructed there is that this Government enlarged the homestead to an extent sufficient to permit those people to support their families in that locality. And this act will have the same effect. It will open up homes to many to-day who have no homes. I am in favor of it for that reason, but I insist upon the proposition that if you are expecting this act to increase the number of feeder cattle in America you are going to be disappointed in its purpose. It will not do so. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, on application or otherwise, to designate as stock-raising lands subject to entry under this act lands the surface of which is, in his opinion, chiefly valuable for grazing and raising forage crops, do not contain merchantable timber, are not susceptible of irrigation from any known source of water supply, and are of such character that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act land of which, owing to its general character or general conditions, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly will not support a family.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Page 2, line 7, strike out the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act land of which, owing to its general character or general conditions, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly will not support a family," and insert the following: "*Provided*, That where any person qualified to make entry under the provisions of this act shall make application to enter any unappropriated public land which has not been designated as subject to entry (provided said application is accompanied and supported by properly corroborated affidavit of the applicant, in duplicate, showing prima facie that the land applied for is of the character contemplated by this act), such application, together with the regular fees and commissions, shall be received by the register and receiver of the land district in which said land is located and suspended until it shall have been determined by the Secretary of the Interior whether said land is actually of that character. That during such suspension the land described in the application shall not be disposed of; and if the said land shall be designated under this act, then such application shall be allowed; otherwise it shall be rejected, subject to appeal. The provisions of this section shall also apply to the application of a qualified entryman to make additional entry of unappropriated public land, the area of which, together with his original entry, shall not exceed 640 acres."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, this should not be treated as a motion to strike out and insert; but it has two separate purposes—a motion to strike out, and then a separate amendment to insert. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FERRIS. I think the gentleman is right about that.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself first to the amendment proposing to strike out the original proviso as found in the bill, as follows:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act land of which, owing to its general character or general conditions, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly will not support a family.

Before speaking of that, my colleague on the committee, Mr. KENT, of California, requested me to say that, with this language stricken out of the bill, if present he would vote against the bill. He is absent on account of illness to-day.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to this proviso that the committee seeks to have stricken out of the bill, I recognize, of course, that upon its face it would place the discretion of the Secretary within very narrow limits, requiring him upon the one hand to designate land which, in his opinion, 640 acres was

sufficient to support a family, and upon the other side requiring him to exclude from such designation land which, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly would not support a family.

But, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to afford homes for those who desire them. It ought not to be the purpose of anybody—and if it is the purpose of anybody it ought to be prevented, if possible—that any provision of this bill or of any other enlarged-homestead law should be used for purposes of speculation or a hold-up for anybody.

Now, I believe that the Secretary should make express designations of lands that should be subject to entry under this enlarged-homestead law. But, Mr. Chairman, lands—of which there are millions of acres in the West—that can not possibly support a family in tracts of 640 acres ought not to be subject to entry under this law, because, in the first place, the man who does enter is sure to fail. After he has made his improvements and after he has spent his time and his money he will sell out to a stockman for a song, and he would be glad to get the song in that case.

In addition to that the gentleman from Idaho, who addressed the committee a few moments ago, has informed me that the State of Idaho has upon its statute books a law providing that a sheep herder shall not drive his sheep within 2 miles of a homestead. Am I correct in that?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. What does that mean? That means if a man goes out here on this public land, 640 acres of which can not support a family, he will be compelled to abandon it sooner or later and sell out to a stockman, and in the meantime the land within 2 miles of the homestead that he has made can not be used for any purpose by a sheep raiser or otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, it ought to be sufficient in extending the liberality of this Government in a 640-acre homestead law first to exhaust the designations made by the Secretary of the Interior. It is not advisable on any account to allow railroad companies having lines out there to advertise all over the country that there are millions of acres of land open to entry, and have people go out and find that by no possibility the entryman can support himself or his family upon it; and for that reason I believe that provision should be retained in the bill, so that the Secretary, in making his designations, will not guarantee the support of a family, but will give some encouragement at least that the lands under this new law will afford some hope to the entryman that he will be able to make it succeed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] in what he has just stated. There are very considerable areas in the State which I have the honor to represent in this House, and I know that there are very considerable areas in a number of other States, where it would be utterly impossible for anyone to support a family upon 640 acres of land. It was for that reason that in the bill which I introduced I proposed a larger homestead for lands of that character. But the committee has seen fit to confine its bill to a 640-acre homestead, and I think perhaps, under all the circumstances and conditions, wisely. But in so doing I think the Secretary should be confined definitely in his designations to lands to which this bill will properly and reasonably apply.

In the first place, the Secretary should not designate lands which may be advantageously utilized under the 320-acre homestead law. There are still considerable areas of lands of that character elsewhere, and lands should be cultivated where they may be advantageously. We want lands farmed wherever they may be profitably farmed. This law, which does not require cultivation, should apply only to lands where cultivation is not ordinarily profitable or possible. It should not, however, offer temptation to men to go onto desert winter ranges and by taking up homesteads here and there very largely reduce the value of those lands for range purposes. There might be a case here and there where that would be done in perfect good faith, here and there a case where a home would be established and where the intent of the law would be fulfilled. But there would be many more cases where the homesteader would not benefit and where the benefit to the public generally for the use of the land for range purposes would be very largely reduced. I think the provision is a wise one and should remain in the bill. Under the terms of this bill the agents of the Secretary of the Interior must make careful examination before designation, for that designation, unlike that provided under the enlarged homestead law, is final and conclusive in bringing these lands within the purview of the act.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of 10 minutes the debate close on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that at the expiration of 10 minutes debate close on this amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands on question. Does the chairman maintain that the provision in the beginning of line 7, page 2, of the bill, which is stricken out there, is inconsistent in any way with the provision in italics? Does he maintain that the two provisions are inconsistent?

Mr. FERRIS. No. They are entirely different matters. They are not the same thing at all.

Mr. NORTON. Those two things could be permitted to remain in the bill without inconsistency?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; but I really think they ought not to be.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope I am not responsible in any way whatever for this committee amendment striking out the language which it is proposed shall be stricken out, although last year I remember, when the bill was up, I poked considerable fun at the committee and at the bill on account of the two provisions in the bill which, if literally construed, would prevent any land from being designated. I see now that they have separated the two propositions. I thought they were to be treated as one amendment. I prefer myself to keep in the bill the language that is proposed to be stricken out, and to keep out of the bill the language that is proposed to be inserted. I do not see any reason, under the second amendment as it is now separated, why anybody should be allowed to go on to these lands until they are designated.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman will recall that some years ago we passed the 320-acre amendment?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Then the gentleman will also recall, I know, because he keeps up with things, that on March 4, 1915—last spring—we passed a provision making this same thing applicable to the 320-acre homesteads.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. And we are only putting it in here to make this bill in conformity with the law as to the 320 acres. That is the object.

Mr. MANN. I understand, but I do not believe in it at all.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course, this language stricken out is another matter altogether.

Mr. MANN. I appreciate that fact. The tendency will be for people to go on these lands where they hope there will be a designation. If the land shall not be subsequently designated, then it is a great injustice to the man who has taken the chance on it. If the land shall thereafter be designated, it is a great injustice to those who have not taken the chance on it, who would have taken the chance if the land had been designated. I do not believe in giving a preference where a preference is not required.

I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that legislation of this sort will be enacted, and possibly it ought to be, though I do not question at all that sooner or later it will be found that most of this land will be consolidated in large holdings. A man can not make a living by raising stock on 640 acres of land which is not tillable. No man can make a living by grazing stock on 640 acres where he can not raise anything else. You can try it if you want to, but you can not succeed in doing that, because it is contrary to nature, and the result will be that when men try to make a living by raising stock on 640 acres which may raise a little grazing grass but will not raise anything else, they will lose their efforts, their time, some little money, and will sell out to some one who will graze on large tracts of land; and in the end it will pass out of the hands of the Government and go into the hands either of large corporations or individual large holders, where it will be profitable to graze stock upon thousands of acres combined.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, before lands can be designated at all under this act, the department must first find that it is chiefly valuable for grazing and the raising of forage crops, such as silo corn, broom corn, kafir corn, fodder, and so forth. They must next find that the land does not contain any merchantable timber. They must next find that it is not susceptible of irrigation from any known source of supply, and they must then find that 640 acres of land of this character is reasonably necessary to support a family.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]—whom I pause at this moment to say is one of the most clear-headed and helpful Members that ever served on any committee or in any House at any time, and to whom I am indebted now and every day for great services rendered me—would further pro-

vide that the Secretary of the Interior shall designate for entry under this act land which, owing to its general character or general condition in his opinion, 640 acres will clearly be needed to support a family.

Now, that forces the Federal Government to do a thing that it can not do. That forces the Federal Government to be an insurer of the thrift, ability, earnestness, and intelligence of men, a thing that no Government and no person can do. Two men enter homesteads side by side. One man is plucky, gingery, determined, industrious, thrifty, and faithful. Another man takes up a homestead on the adjoining section under precisely similar school conditions, water conditions, and soil conditions, everything being identical. Still one fails and the other succeeds. I am afraid if this amendment is agreed to, it will make the Government an insurer that both men will achieve the same result. A thing, in my opinion, totally wanting in practicability and feasibility.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that in the Reclamation Service they are determining the quantity that will be sufficient to support a family in making their allotments?

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman is entirely correct, but in reclamation work the area is small. They have to journey over only a small area, and they can tell from the water conditions and the quality of the water and the quality of the soil more nearly what can be done. But in journeying all over creation, in that wild, unsettled, and barren waste of land which they have out there, I think it would be impossible to do what the gentleman hopes.

Mr. LENROOT. If 1,000,000 acres or 10,000,000 acres are designated under this amendment, does the gentleman think it more likely that the land so designated will offer a better hope to the man who enters upon it than if all the land is thrown open to entry?

Mr. FERRIS. As a westerner who has gone through the thick and the thin, the fat and the lean, of building up a new country, I do not believe in it. I believe the moment the Government says, "This 640 acres will support a family," every real-estate grafter in that community or that State will seize the opportunity to bamboozle the public and will use the Federal Government as a catspaw to accomplish that purpose. I fear that is what will happen.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, if ten times as much is opened to entry, as will be opened with this amendment stricken out of the bill, does it not offer just tenfold opportunity to the real-estate grafters?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think so, although I do not want to be tenacious about it. This bill was sent to the department, as it is proper that all such bills should be sent there, to get the opinion of the department upon it. Our committee has been criticized good-naturedly and not good-naturedly for having the department draft these bills. That is true. We call in the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office and we get their opinion. We need their help. We appreciate their help and will continue to seek their help. Let us see what the Interior Department think of this. I quote from a letter written December 15, 1915, by First Assistant Secretary Jones, of the Interior Department:

As suggested in my report of April 24, 1914, it is believed that it would be advisable to omit the proviso to section 2—

That is the proviso under consideration—

found in lines 6 to 10, page 2 of the bill, thus leaving to the settler the responsibility of determining whether or not a specific 640 acres of land, designated under this act, would be sufficient for his purposes. Such has been the law and practice under the original and enlarged homestead acts, as well as the act of April 28, 1904, hereinbefore described. If, however, the committee believes some limitation to be essential, the proviso as it now stands is as far as the limitation should proceed.

I really hope that the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman means that he hopes the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, leave it out of the bill. I was technically stating it wrong, but I think the House understands it. To make it clear, I want the committee's action to stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on striking out the proviso.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. LENROOT and Mr. MONDELL) there were 38 ayes and 6 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

At the end of section 2 insert the following:

"Provided, That where any person qualified to make entry under the provisions of this act shall make application to enter any unappropriated public land which has not been designated as subject to entry (provided said application is accompanied and supported by properly corroborated

affidavit of the applicant, in duplicate, showing prima facie that the land applied for is of the character contemplated by this act), such application, together with the regular fees and commissions, shall be received by the register and receiver of the land district in which said land is located and suspended until it shall have been determined by the Secretary of the Interior whether said land is actually of that character. That during such suspension the land described in the application shall not be disposed of; and if the said land shall be designated under this act, then such application shall be allowed; otherwise it shall be rejected, subject to appeal. The provisions of this section shall also apply to the application of a qualified entryman to make additional entry of unappropriated public land, the area of which, together with his original entry, shall not exceed 640 acres."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 2, after the word "appeal," strike out the remainder of the section.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the language proposed to be stricken out by the amendment reads as follows:

The provisions of this section shall also apply to the application of a qualified entryman to make additional entry of unappropriated public land, the area of which, together with his original entry, shall not exceed 640 acres.

As that language now stands it is open to the construction that it is the purpose of the bill to grant to anyone who has made a former homestead entry the right to make an entry under this act to an amount of land, together with the original entry, that would make 640 acres. That was not the purpose of the committee in this amendment, the purpose being only to provide for a preference right to have designation made for those who shall be entitled to make an additional entry.

If this amendment is adopted, I will offer another making it clear that the right of preference shall be given to the original entryman, the one to be entitled under the bill to make additional entries.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if this language was subject to the interpretation which the gentleman from Wisconsin places upon it, I should be opposed to having it stricken out, but I do not think it is subject to that interpretation. It is as a matter of fact an altogether ineffective proposition as it stands, and therefore should go out. Under the decisions of the Land Office for a number of years no one is a qualified homestead entryman under a provision such as this bill contains who has perfected a homestead entry of any size, and up to this time in this bill we have made no provision which would in any way tend to modify the ruling of the department. Therefore, a provision at this point to the effect that the application of a qualified entryman shall be received to make an additional entry would be of no effect, because under the rulings of the department anyone who has heretofore made an entry is not a qualified entryman.

Mr. BORLAND. Would it not accomplish the purpose if the word "qualified," in line 3, was stricken out?

Mr. MONDELL. It would. I am in favor of having such a provision and I intended to offer an amendment later.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is in favor of a man who has taken a homestead in a public-land State of less than 640 acres being permitted to take the balance up to 640 acres under this law?

Mr. MONDELL. I am very much in favor of it.

Mr. BORLAND. Would not that be accomplished by striking out the word "qualified"?

Mr. MONDELL. It would be an indirect way, but not a very certain way of accomplishing it. I think it ought to be accomplished directly.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It seems to me that if the gentleman considers the other amendment which is to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin it would obviate any objection he may have.

Mr. MONDELL. I have no objection. I think the language proposed to be stricken out would not be operative either to accomplish what was intended or what I would like to have accomplished, therefore I think it ought to go out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "make," insert the words "original or additional," so that the line will read: "Provided, That where any person qualified to make original or additional entry under the provisions of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the committee amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I had supposed that somebody would, and perhaps somebody has, given us a statement about the amount of land entered as homestead in the last few years. I used very often to hear on the floor of the House a statement from gentlemen, sometimes from the West, complaining that all the land that people could cultivate was taken up, and that there was nothing left except land that you had to give away in large quantities in order to get people on it. I have not examined this year the report for last year showing the amount of land patented or entered as homestead.

Mr. LENROOT. I can give the gentleman the figures.

Mr. MANN. For a great many years I have noticed that notwithstanding the statements made to us every year that all of the good lands are gone each year there was more land entered under homestead entries than had been the year before, and since I have been a Member of the House I think more land has been taken under the homestead entry than had been taken altogether in the history of the Government prior to that time, and I am not sure but that in the last 10 years of my service in the House that statement would be true if limited to the 10-year period. I now yield to the gentleman to give me the figures.

Mr. LENROOT. Last year there were 37,343 homestead entries, covering an acreage of 7,180,981.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, that is a good deal more than was taken under homestead entries the first year, or the first years, that I came here. How much of that is taken under the 320-acre law I do not know, but all of the land which can be cultivated and support a family, with a reasonable acreage, is not yet gone, any more than have all of the fish yet been taken out of the sea. We are sometimes led to believe that there is no more good land left. Mr. Chairman, as a rule, there never was any good land left. When the people settled in the State of Illinois, even when I was a boy, long after a good many people had settled there, it was said the land was not worth anything. Most of the people thought that you could not raise much crop upon it; and they thought right, for you could not at that time, but they have made it over since. They were not troubled, as a rule, in my part of the country by any lack of water, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think something ought to be said at some point during the consideration of this bill along the lines of the suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. It has been made to appear whenever this question is brought up that there is no available land left for homestead entry under present laws, I hold in my hand the last report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and on page 67 of that report he gives the number of homestead entries made and the acreage year by year since the homestead law was passed in 1868. I will put into the Record merely the 10-year periods, so that we may see whether or not, so far as we can gather from entries being made, there is any necessity for the passage of this bill at all. In 1870 there were 4,041 entries, covering 519,727 acres. In 1880 the number increased to 15,441, covering 1,938,234 acres. In 1890 the number of entrymen increased to 28,080, and the acreage to 4,060,592. In 1900 there were 25,286 entrymen and 3,477,842 acres taken. In 1910 the number was 23,253 and the acreage 3,795,862, while in 1915, the figures I gave a moment ago, there were 37,343 entrymen with an acreage of 7,180,981.

So, Mr. Chairman, it does not appear from these statistics that there is any dearth of lands or entrymen as yet calling for the passage of this bill, at least to the extent of saying that there is no land left open for entry under the 320-acre homestead law and that they must be given 640. In the last three years there have been more homestead entries made and allowed by the Land Office and more acres have gone into private ownership under the homestead laws than there were in any five-year period since the homestead law was passed. That merely furnishes a reason why the provisions of this bill ought to be scrutinized pretty carefully and why we ought not to act upon the assumption that we have to indulge in the utmost liberality in order to secure homestead entries upon what is left of the public domain.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Since I have been a Member of this House I have frequently heard the assertion made that western Members are continually saying that all of the public lands are taken up that are suitable for homestead entry under existing laws. I have been a Member for five years, and I have never heard any western Member make any assertion of that kind. It has not been made since I have been a Member of the House.

I have heard frequently the western Members say that the good land, that which was irrigable and arable, in a large section of the country was taken up, and that is the fact. I will admit all that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has just said. But that does not prove anything, because he does not tell in what localities that land was taken nor in what sections of the country. There are yet large areas of public land that can be taken under existing law. There are a few States that practically have all that land, and there are other States that have thousands and hundreds of thousands of acres such as is covered by this homestead bill that is before the House to-day.

Now, in my own State we are not so greatly interested in this measure, although we have on river bluffs and in certain localities a lot of this character of land; but I do know from my knowledge of the West that there are in some States thousands of acres, hundreds of thousands of acres, and millions of acres of this kind of land that will make homes for people in time, and that will enable large areas that are now of no benefit to anybody, except a few nomadic stockmen, to come on the tax rolls and becoming taxpaying property and also add to the population of those States. I do not understand that this land is of a character that there can not be an acre of it farmed. I do not think that anyone contemplates that there could not be any of it farmed, but it must be chiefly valuable for stock raising and not for the raising of crops to enable a man to make a living for his family. I think the bill is a wise one. There may be in some cases mistakes made under the law. There has never yet been a homestead law but what there have been some mistakes made; but going on the principle of trying to benefit the greatest number of people, I think that this bill should pass, and that in time, as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has said, we should enlarge the area. I am not one of those who believe that the nomadic stockman, the man who is getting the benefit of public property for nothing and who has had it that way for 30 or 40 years, should be continued in that privilege in perpetuity or during the rest of the existence of the United States.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer a substantial amendment. Some of us agree here that we might not know much about different characters of land, but we wondered a little about the language in the first sentence of this paragraph.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. What page?

Mr. MAPES. Page 2, section 2. Section 2 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to designate certain lands, "the surface of which is chiefly valuable for grazing and raising forage crops," and then continues "do not contain merchantable timber," and so forth. What is the subject of "do not contain"?

Mr. FERRIS. "Lands" is the subject.

Mr. MAPES. "Lands" is in the objective case, the object of "to designate."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. "Lands" is the subject.

Mr. MAPES. Then the words "and which" should be inserted after the word "crops" in line 3, page 2.

Mr. MANN. "Which" is there.

Mr. MAPES. But it refers to the word "surface."

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. MAPES. "The surface of which is." If that is the subject, then the verb should be in the singular, "does contain."

Mr. FERRIS. I think we are all right.

Mr. MAPES. I do not know which the committee desired to have the subject. If I can find out, I will offer an amendment.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I always hesitate to get into any argument in reference to grammar, and I do so with a great deal of trepidation now. My opinion is that "land" is the subject, and "surface" there relates back to land.

Mr. MAPES. "Lands" is in the objective case, the object of "to designate."

Mr. BORLAND. It is an objective phrase. If the gentleman will yield, it is an objective sentence, an objective phrase, as it is sometimes called.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert, in line 3, on page 2, after the word "crops," the words "and which," so that the sentence will read: "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate lands the surface of which is valuable and which do not contain," and so forth. Some such amendment is necessary in order to make the sentence read correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "crops," insert the words "and which."

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we close debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto. Of course, I mean after we vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that debate close on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the gentleman's request? I have an amendment pending which I wish to discuss.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman wish five minutes?

Mr. MONDELL. I think there may be some discussion on it. It is an entirely new division.

Mr. MANN. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] that we would not like to enter upon a long discussion to-night, and I think, under the circumstances, there may be something in the House to be taken care of.

Mr. FERRIS. Let us get rid of this section.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me suggest—

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close debate on this amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the request?

Mr. FERRIS. On this amendment only.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FERRIS. Can not we adopt this section?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division on the amendment that I offered.

Mr. MONDELL. I have an amendment to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 16, noes 28.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject discussed to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on this bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. BORLAND having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Cox, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 407) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be included in the same request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to address the House on Friday immediately after the reading of the Journal, unless it should interfere with the business in hand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman withhold his request for a moment for the gentlemen who are asking to extend remarks on the pending bill? Are there any more requests from gentlemen to extend their remarks on the pending bill?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 40 minutes on Friday immediately after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. FERRIS. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman does not desire to interfere with this or any other regularly reported bill?

Mr. BAILEY. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks, subject to the regular business of the House, that he be permitted to address the House on Friday next for 40 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, it is very convenient for a Member to make a request so that he knows the very minute when he is going to address the House. As a rule he is lucky if he knows within a week when he is going to do so. I am constantly asked by Members of the House on this side

for time, and I have told them they would have to take chances on the general debate which is coming along on various bills. And unless there is special reason for it I will have to say the same thing to my friend from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object. I have no doubt that he can get in on Friday.

Mr. FERRIS. May I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he might get in on the road bill to-morrow?

Mr. MANN. Or on Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, if he is on the job.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 320. An act to authorize the county of Bonner, Idaho, to construct a bridge across Pend Oreille River;

H. R. 775. An act granting the consent of Congress to J. P. Jones and others to construct one or more bridges across the Chattahoochee River between the counties of Coweta and Carroll, in the State of Georgia; and

H. R. 7611. An act authorizing the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., a corporation, to construct and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across what is known as Back River, a part of the Savannah River, at a point between Jasper County, S. C., and Chatham County, Ga.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 18, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a detailed statement of the number of documents received and the number distributed by this department during the calendar year 1915 (H. Doc. No. 587); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed statement of receipts from rentals, extension of Capitol Grounds, for the period beginning January 20, 1915, and ending November 30, 1915 (S. Doc. No. 25); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of harbor of refuge at Portage Lake, Manistee County, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 588); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Wickford Harbor, R. I. (H. Doc. No. 589); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Hendricks Harbor, Me. (H. Doc. No. 590); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and plan and estimate of cost of improvement of Pagan River and Jones Creek, Va. (H. Doc. No. 591); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting a change in the estimates of this department on page 58 of the Annual Book of Estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, under the title "Salaries, office of assistant treasurer at Cincinnati, Ohio" (H. Doc. No. 592); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8234) to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes, reported

the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 46), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 153) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 44), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLOOD, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8235) to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 45), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CURRY, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 449) to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 47), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas, from the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6057) to amend section 14 of the reclamation-extension act approved August 13, 1914, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 48), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. OGLESBY, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3042) to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, and amending the laws relating thereto, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 54), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7502) for the relief of Ellis P. Garton, administrator of the estate of H. B. Garton, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 49), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1584) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Louis Landram, administrator of William J. Landram, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 50), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POUL, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2180) for the relief of Albert Greenlaw, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 51), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2288) for the relief of Thomas R. Mason, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 52), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CAPSTICK, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4587) for the relief of C. C. Graham, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 53), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9209) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Clayton, Jefferson County, N. Y., a brass or bronze cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9210) providing means for assessments against the lands of restricted Creek Indians in drainage district No. 1, McIntosh County, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 9211) to provide for a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Lewisburg, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9212) to regulate the price of gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9213) to authorize the Gary Land Co. to construct a bridge across the Grand Calumet River in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 9214) to provide for the municipal collection and disposal of city refuse in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 9215) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908," approved March 4, 1907; and to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907," approved June 30, 1906; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 9216) to amend sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON: A bill (H. R. 9217) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Warrenton, Ga., two condemned bronze or brass cannon, with their carriages and a suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9218) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dike on South Slough, Lane County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 9219) to provide for the acquisition, ownership, and operation by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of all the street railroads located in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9220) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to place on the firemen's pension roll of the District the names of certain persons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 9221) for the relief of mail contractors; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9222) to increase the compensation of certain employees of the Government Hospital for the Insane, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9223) for the purpose of preserving life at sea, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 9224) providing for an increase in number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 9225) granting the consent of Congress to Georgia Lumber Co. to construct a bridge across Flint River, Ga., between Dooly and Sumter Counties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 9226) to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric light and power within the Lihue district and the Koloa district, county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 9227) to prohibit the receipt of money by internal-revenue officials of the United States in payment of special taxes by dealers in intoxicating liquors, except in certain cases, and to provide punishments therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9228) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896," approved February 28, 1895; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 9229) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain lands for the use of the Seminole Indians of Florida; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 9230) to authorize the erection of a monument at Fort Seybert, W. Va., to commemorate the capture and massacre of Capt. Seybert and a number of men and women at that point and in the South Fork and South Branch valleys of the Potomac by the noted Indian chief, Kill Buck, and his band of Indian warriors in the year 1758; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 9231) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, amending section 913 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, relating to annual payments by the Honolulu Gas Co. (Ltd.), under its franchise, of a per centum of its gross annual receipts; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 9232) authorizing the extension of Kenyon Street NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 9233) authorizing a survey of Tangipahoa River, La.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 9234) appropriating money for the improvement of the Allegheny River, Pa., from Tarentum, Pa., to East Brady, Pa.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 9235) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER: Resolution (H. Res. 94) amending paragraph 7, Rule XXIV, of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 95) for the relief of the widow of Junius B. Holloway, late an employee of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GANDY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 105) providing that hereafter no tribal funds belonging to any Indian tribes shall be expended without specific authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 106) providing that hereafter no tribal funds of any Indians shall be expended without specific authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial from the Legislature of California, favoring Federal aid for indigent nonresident tuberculous patients cared for in hospitals which conform to the hygienic standard established by the United States Treasury Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of California, to standardize the treatment of tuberculosis in the United States, to provide Federal aid in caring for indigent tuberculous persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of the Legislature of California, favoring Federal legislation in aid of indigent tuberculous persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 9236) granting an increase of pension to William H. Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9237) granting an increase of pension to George Garrard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 9238) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Waltz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9239) granting an increase of pension to William A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 9240) granting a pension to Clara Woomer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 9241) granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. Sargent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9242) granting a pension to Helen Swan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9243) for the relief of August Schultz; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 9244) for the relief of Jacob Scott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9245) granting a pension to Charles B. Montgomery; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9246) granting a pension to Mary Sheridan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9247) granting a pension to Mariette Hathaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9248) granting an increase of pension to Morgan Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 9249) granting a pension to Thomas B. Perkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9250) granting a pension to Sarah E. Dillon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9251) granting an increase of pension to John H. Rusie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9252) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Kemp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9253) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Stierwalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9254) to correct the military record of James Flint; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9255) to correct the military record of Martin All; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 9256) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Ordway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9257) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Comerford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 9258) for the relief of Joseph H. Lawrence; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 9259) granting a pension to Rosetta Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 9260) granting a pension to Edith Barcia; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9261) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Culhan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9262) granting an increase of pension to Harland R. Strong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 9263) for the relief of John N. Shiltz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 9264) granting a pension to Peter Kanuk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 9265) granting a pension to Emma F. Bonesteel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 9266) granting an increase of pension to Harlow Havens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9267) granting an increase of pension to William H. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9268) granting a pension to Mahala Claflin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 9269) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9270) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cooke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9271) granting an increase of pension to William H. Pennington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 9272) granting an increase of pension to Levi R. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 9273) granting a pension to John W. Roderick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9274) granting an increase of pension to Maria M. Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9275) granting an increase of pension to James Hutson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9276) granting a pension to Charlotte A. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9277) granting a pension to Nellie M. Tillman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9278) granting a pension to John C. Pearson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9279) granting a pension to Frazier Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9280) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Putnam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 9281) granting an increase of pension to Narcissa N. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9282) granting a pension to Lewis J. Crider; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9283) granting an increase of pension to Pollis Blon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9284) granting an increase of pension to Charles Lang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9285) granting an increase of pension to Silas J. Shumaker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 9286) to correct the military record of William B. Johns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9287) granting a pension to Martin Guthrie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9288) providing for the refund of certain duties illegally levied and collected on acetate of lime; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 9289) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Glenn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 9290) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Loomis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 9291) for the relief of the estate of Thomas J. Mellon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 9292) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Maris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9293) granting a pension to Robert Chestnut; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 9294) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda A. Perine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OAKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9295) granting an increase of pension to Minnie M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLNEY: A bill (H. R. 9296) for the relief of Walter W. Parker for overtime work in the Navy Department; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 9297) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Dovel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9298) granting an increase of pension to Darwin Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9299) granting an increase of pension to Darwin Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 9300) granting a pension to Martha Provo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9301) granting an increase of pension to John H. Ormsby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 9302) granting a pension to Sidney W. Ackerman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 9303) for the relief of Mrs. L. A. Butler; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROWLAND: A bill (H. R. 9304) granting a pension to Myrtle Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9305) granting an increase of pension to John Schwoebel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9306) granting an increase of pension to William H. Keen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9307) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Stahler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9308) granting a pension to Emelia McNicol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9309) granting a pension to Anna Bryson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9310) granting a pension to Charles W. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 9311) for the relief of Michael Flaherty, guardian of John Flaherty, claimant; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 9312) for the relief of the heirs of Solomon Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9313) granting a pension to Anna Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9314) granting an increase of pension to John A. Golden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany House bill 6938, for relief of William C. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9143, for relief of Mary F. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of sundry merchants of Kansas, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Weyauwega, Wis., favoring woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of E. R. Hayhurst, favoring House bill 476; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. T. Russell, favoring the Smith-Hughes bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of Standard Bleachery Co., of Carlton Hill, N. Y., favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs in United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 8119, for the relief of Mary E. Temple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of F. W. Thurston Co., of Chicago, favoring the Hill bill, H. R. 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Merrimac Hat Co., of Amesbury, Mass., urging prompt passage of House bill 702, relating to the dyestuff situation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petition of the Winsted Hosiery Co., favoring bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of the Guardian Savings & Trust Co., of Cleveland, Ohio., protesting against stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. M. Pattison Supply Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 50,000 members of the German-American Alliance, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring embargo on war munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Woolen Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEATON: Memorial of Washington Camp, No. 84, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Ashland; Clinton W. Shearer and S. B. Edwards, of Pottsville, Pa., relative to national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Ribber Manufacturing Co., of Pottsville, Pa., favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Hockannin Mills, of Rockville, Conn., favoring passage of a bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Petitions of business men of Murfreesboro, Petersburg, Lewisburg, Smyrna, Manchester, Shelbyville, Fayetteville, and Tullahoma, Tenn., favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of Capt. Santwein and all other officers and enlisted men of Company C, First Infantry, National Guard of Missouri, favoring passage of militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Melklejohn Co., of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lymanville Co., of Providence, R. I., favoring passage of bill protecting manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Albany, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Milaca, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Eden Valley, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Rice, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Memorial of Branch 108, Paving Cutters' Union of United States and Canada, Willards Point, Me., favoring law preventing importation of foreign-made paving blocks to be sold at prices below reasonable cost of production in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Watertown, N. Y., favoring adequate measures to prevent shipping congestion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of H. D. Pierce, of Pine City, N. Y., favoring a uniform divorce law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of Religious Society of Friends, of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Neutrality and Peace Convention, relative to violation of neutrality by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Traffic Club of New York and Philadelphia Bourse, favoring repeal of the seamen's law; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petitions of sundry banking and trust companies of Texas, favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry business men of the State of Texas, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of veterans of the Confederate Army, favoring law granting pensions to widows and minor children of Confederate veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Woman's Missionary Society of Colorado, Tex., protesting against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Toledo (Ohio) Scale Co., against passage of House bill 150, to regulate weights and measures; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial of Baraca class of the Tabernacle Baptist Church, of Utica, N. Y., favoring law censoring moving-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of Utica (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring assistance to relieve conditions relative to the congestion of freight at railway terminals in United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Utica (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the fixing of railway-mail pay by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petitions of Local Union 682 and District No. 2, United Mine Workers of America, protesting against military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of District No. 23, United Mine Workers of America, and Kentucky State Federation of Labor, asking that the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations be printed in full; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Memorial of the Boulder Commercial Association, favoring passage of House bill 651, as fair to both shipper and carrier; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 18, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast enabled us out of various kindred peoples and tongues to erect a great empire dedicated to exact and equal justice and to the freedom of all. We bless Thee for the privileges of freedom. We come to Thee continually that we may be taught that higher liberty wherewith Thou dost make men free. Give to us the Divine inspiration that a conscience quickened by Divine wisdom may rightly decide all the issues of life. Give us the power by that spiritual appropriation that we may not be bound in the prison house of a merely sensuous intellect. God grant to lead us in the realm of the higher and eternal, that we may perform our functions not only as citizens of this state but of the higher kingdom. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM IDAHO.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator elect from Idaho, is in the Chamber and desires to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho will present his colleague at the Vice President's desk that the oath may be administered to him.

Mr. BRADY was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. BORAH, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him.

SAN FRANCISCO WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, at yesterday's session of the Senate my colleague [Mr. PHELAN] had printed in the RECORD some matter relating to the Hetch Hetchy grant. I was very earnestly opposed to the grant at the time the bill was before the Senate, because, in my judgment, the city of San Francisco did not need the water and it was needed by the owners of land in San Joaquin Valley, as it would irrigate hundreds of thou-